

YELLOW LIGHT

No. CCLXXXVI (286)

January 5, 2013

A priest friend of the SSPX watches anxiously its present turn towards Newrome. He no longer fully approves, nor yet fully disapproves.

Not all of you readers of “Eleison Comments” may have come across the admirable letter of two months ago written by Fr. Ronald Ringrose to the US District Superior of the Society of St Pius X, Fr. Arnauld Rostand. Fr Ringrose has been for over 30 years the independent pastor of the Traditional parish of St Athanasius just outside Washington, D.C., and for all that time he has been the faithful friend, without being a member, of the SSPX. However in June of last year he hosted in his parish the first meeting in the USA of the nucleus of priests now forming a Resistance to that change of direction of the Society, long latent, but which became clear to all in the spring of last year. As Bishop Fellay’s faithful executive in the USA, Fr. Rostand wrote to him to propose a meeting where he might persuade Fr Ringrose that the change was no change. Here is Fr. Ringrose’s reply:—

“Thank you for your letter of October 12 in which you offer to meet to discuss the situation within the Society of St Pius X. While this is a very kind offer on your part and I appreciate it very much, I don’t think that such a meeting will serve any useful purpose, since the problems stem from the Society’s top leadership, and you are not in a position to change that.

It is true that I have been a strong supporter of the Society for many years. This support was based on the fact that my mission as a priest, and the Society’s mission were one and the same, to help souls hold onto the Catholic faith during this time when it seems to have been abandoned by post Vatican II Rome.

Now I have to be more cautious and reserved in that support. I am alarmed that the Superior General would say that 95% of Vatican II is acceptable. I am astounded that the Society’s leadership would respond to three of the Society’s bishops by suggesting that they are making the errors of Vatican II into a “super-heresy.” I am disappointed that the Society’s response to Assisi III was so weak and anemic. I am saddened by the Society’s unjust disciplining of priests who are following the example of Archbishop Lefebvre, and I am outraged at the treatment of Bishop Williamson – not just his

recent expulsion, but the shabby treatment he has gotten over the past few years.

Prior to this year, when asked about the Society by an inquiring parishioner, I always gave the Society a green light. Given the Society's recent actions, I do not yet give the Society a red light, but I do give it a yellow light of caution. The red light will come if and when the Society allows herself to be absorbed into the Conciliar Church that Archbishop Lefebvre so vigorously resisted.

It is with great sadness that I write these words. There are many good, zealous, faithful priests within the Society's ranks. Many of them I know personally and admire. Many souls depend on them. It is out of love for the Society that I fear for her future. I fear that she is on a suicidal path. The leadership may think that a deal is off the table, but I fear that that is not the thinking of Rome.

I pray for the Society to return to the mission given to her by Archbishop Lefebvre without compromise or hedging. When she does, she will have my unreserved support."

And Fr Ringrose's letter concludes with fraternal greetings. It is truly a model of clear-mindedness and courtesy, firmness and charity. Long live Fr Ringrose to maintain an incomparable bastion of Catholicism right next to the United States' capital city!

Kyrie eleison.

FIFTIESISM RETURNS

No. CCLXXXVII (287)

January 12, 2013

If the Newsociety's leaders are now failing, one explanation is that they are reverting to the relatively cosy Catholicism of the 1950's.

Burning question: how could the leaders of the Society of St Pius X, which was founded by Archbishop Lefebvre to resist the Newchurch, now be seeking its favours in order to rejoin it? One answer is that they never fully understood the Archbishop. After the disaster of Vatican II in the 1960's, they saw in him the best continuation of the pre-disaster Church of the 1950's. In reality he was much more than that, but once he died, all they wanted was to go back to the cosy Catholicism of the 1950's. And they were not alone in preferring Christ without his Cross. It is a very popular formula.

For was not the Catholicism of the 1950's like a man standing on the edge of a tall and dangerous cliff? On the one hand it was still standing at a great height, otherwise Vatican II would not have been such a fall. On the other hand it was dangerously close to the edge of the cliff, otherwise again it could not have fallen so precipitously in the 1960's. By no means everything was bad in the Church of the 1950's, but it was too close to disaster. Why?

Because Catholics in general in the 1950's were outwardly maintaining the appearances of the true religion, but inwardly too many were flirting with the godless errors of the modern world: liberalism (what matters most in life is freedom), subjectivism (so man's mind and will are free of any objective truth or law), indifferentism (so it does not matter what religion a man has), and so on. So Catholics having the faith and not wanting to lose it, gradually adapted it to these errors. They would attend Mass on Sundays, they might still go to confession, but they would be feeding their minds on the vile media, and their hearts would be chafing at certain laws of the Church, on marriage for the laity, on celibacy for the clergy. So they might be keeping the faith, but they wanted less and less to swim against the powerful current of the glamorous and irreligious world all around them. They were getting closer and closer to the edge of the cliff.

Now the Archbishop had his failings, which one may think are reflected in the present difficulties of the Society. Let us not idolize him. Nevertheless he was in the 1950's a bishop who had both the appearances of Catholicism and, deep inside him, its substance, as proved by the rich fruits of his apostolic ministry in Africa. Thus when Vatican II succeeded in crippling or paralyzing nearly all of his fellow bishops, he managed to recreate, almost alone, a pre-Vatican II seminary and Congregation. The appearances of his Catholic oasis amidst the Conciliar desert dazzled many a good young man. Vocations were also attracted by the Archbishop's personal charisma. But from ten to 20 years after his death in 1991 the substance of his heritage came to seem heavier and heavier to push against the ever stronger current of the modern world.

So, disinclined to go on bearing the Cross of being scorned by the mainstream Church and the world, the SSPX leaders began to dream of being once more officially recognized. And the dream took hold, because after all dreams are so much nicer than reality. We must pray for these leaders of the SSPX. The 1950's are gone, gone for ever, and it is sheer dreaming to wish for their return.

Kyrie eleison.

TWO JOURNEYS

No. CCLXXXVIII (288)

January 19, 2013

The SSPX leadership has long disguised its leftwards slide, blocked temporarily by the General Chapter, but liable to pick up again.

Journeys since mid-December, to North America and France, have enabled me to observe within the Society of St Pius X a dangerous state of indetermination. Where the District Superior is not blind, the danger is for the moment held back somewhat, so that resistance is puzzled. Where however the District Superior is a willing servant of SSPX headquarters, there the movement towards the Newchurch forges ahead, but also the Resistance is taking shape. What is at stake?

Ever since the breakout of Protestantism, the world has been sliding further and further away from God. Thanks to the Council of Trent (1545–1563), the Catholic Church held firm, but thanks to the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965) the official Catholic Church joined in the slide. Then thanks mainly (but not only!) to Archbishop Lefebvre (1905–1991), relics of the Church of Trent gathered themselves together to form amidst the desert of modernity a Catholic oasis, the SSPX. But where the mighty Church had not been able to resist, it was, sure enough, merely a matter of time before the puny SSPX would be tempted in its turn to join in the slide.

However, just as at Vatican II the Church's official leadership was obliged to pretend that it was not breaking with the Tridentine Church (such is, for instance, Benedict XVI's "hermeneutic of continuity"), so the SSPX's official leadership is now obliged to pretend that it is not breaking with Archbishop Lefebvre. Thus, like most politicians of the last 500 years, these SSPX leaders are talking to the right while walking to the left, because that is what a large number of people want, namely the appearance of Christianity without its substance (cf. II Tim. III, 1–5, especially verse 5). Like Descartes, such leaders "advance behind a mask," seeking to disguise their move to the left beneath words to the right, or words clearly ambiguous.

What happened in the SSPX last spring, as Fr Chazal says, is that the mask came off, because the SSPX leadership must have calculated that the time had come for it to make its open move back into the mainstream Church. Alas for these leaders, there

emerged between March and June enough resistance to block at the SSPX General Chapter in July any immediate attempt to join the Newchurch. And so from that Chapter onwards, the mask has gone back on. But liberals do not convert, short of a miracle of grace, because leftwardness is their real religion. That is why the SSPX leaders are surely waiting for the modern world, flesh and devil to continue their work of pulling SSPX clergy and laity to the left so that within a few years at most there will no longer be any significant resistance, as there was last summer, to the SSPX rejoining the Newchurch.

This leaves the SSPX betwixt and between. However, as the common sense of Archbishop Lefebvre remarked, superiors mould subjects and not the other way round. That is why, unless the present SSPX leaders are displaced by a miracle, the SSPX is doomed to be dissolved within the Newchurch. One can hardly say the punishment would not have been deserved. But let us pray to the Mother of God for some miracles of her Divine Son's mercy.

Kyrie eleison.

LIBERALISM – BLASPHEMY

No. CCLXXXIX (289)

January 26, 2013

Every liberal is a crusader, making war ultimately on God. By flirting with Newrome, the Newsociety follows this suicidal path.

Is liberalism really as horrible as it is made out to be? This or that person is accused of being a “liberal,” yet a number of those accused vigorously deny that the label attaches to them. Who is right? Accusers or accused? Since “liberalism” is one name for the all-embracing error of modern times, responsible for throwing souls without number into the fires of Hell, it surely deserves one more approach.

Now freedom relates either to what I am free from, i.e. some constraint or other, or it relates to what I am free for, i.e. some purpose or other. Of these two relatives of freedom, the negative freedom from constraint comes both before the positive purpose in time, but after it in importance. It comes before in time, because if I am constrained from achieving a purpose, my achieving that purpose is out of the question. On the other hand it comes after it in importance because the value of the non-constraint will depend on the value of the purpose for which it is used. Thus holding a knife frees me from being unarmed, but if I use that freedom-from for cutting up food to eat, the freedom-from is good, but if I use it for carving up my grandmother, the freedom-from becomes murderous.

Now what liberalism does is to make the freedom-from a – or the – supreme value in itself, regardless of the freedom-for, or the good or bad purpose for which it will be used. Thus liberty or freedom-from is made independent of a good or bad purpose, independent of right and wrong. But the difference between right and wrong is an essential part of God’s creation, designed from the forbidden fruit in the Garden of Eden onwards for man to make his choice between Heaven and Hell. Therefore to put man’s lack of constraint in front of God’s law is to put man before God.

Being then the implicit denial of God’s moral law, of right and wrong, liberalism implicitly makes war on God, putting man’s human “right” to choose in front of God’s divine right to command. Now as Archbishop Lefebvre used to say, liberals come in 36 different varieties, by no means all of which mean to make war on God. But war on

God remains the logical conclusion of liberals giving supreme value to liberty, and it is the reason why for many of them, anything goes. God and his rules having been pushed to one side, then the adoration of liberty becomes for liberals their substitute religion, a religion with no rules except their own will. Being moreover a substitute religion, it must get rid of the true religion which blocks its way, and so liberals naturally become crusaders against God's order in all corners of his Creation: marriages free of gender, families free of children, States free of a head, life free of morals, and so on, and so on. Such a war on God's reality is completely insane, yet liberals, apparently so sweet to their fellow-men whom they are "liberating," can in fact be utterly cruel to anybody who gets in the way of their crusade. It is in the logic of their substitute religion that they need observe no normal decency in trampling upon anti-liberals, who deserve no compassion.

For 20 centuries the Catholic Church condemned such insanity. Yet at Vatican II the official Church gave way to it, by for instance declaring ("Dignitatis Humanae") that every State must protect rather its citizens' freedom-from civil constraint in the practice of their choice of religion than their freedom-for the practice of the true religion. And now the leaders of a certain religious Society want to put it under the authority of the Vatican II Romans. For the true religion, such action is, as Archbishop Lefebvre called it, "Operation Suicide." But then liberalism is intrinsically suicidal.

Kyrie eleison.

THERESA'S PRAYER

No. CCXC (290)

February 2, 2013

A famous prayer of St Theresa of Avila, turning wholly to God, is more and more suitable for our times turning away.

It is extraordinary how far God is lost to the great number of souls around us today. It is in him that every one of us “lives and moves and has his being” (Acts, XVII, 28). Without him we cannot lift a finger, think a thought or do any naturally good action, let alone any supernaturally good action. All that we can do by ourselves, without him, is to sin, and even then the sinful action as action comes from God, only its sinfulness comes from ourselves, because the sinfulness is in itself something not positive but defective.

Yet the mass of souls around us treat God as though he does not exist, or, if he does exist, as though he is of no importance. It is a truly incredible state of affairs. It is getting worse day by day. It cannot last. It can only be compared with the state of mankind in the time of Noah. Men's corruption at that time was such (Gen. VI, 11–12) that unless God took away from them the use of their most precious endowment, their free-will – just see how most men react when one tries to force them to do something! – then the only way they left for him to save any significant number of them was to inflict a universal chastisement in which they would nevertheless have time to repent. That was the Flood, a historical event proved by a mass of geological evidence.

Similarly today, a worldwide chastisement is surely, before God, the only way that mankind has left for him to save still any large number of souls from the horror of their damning themselves for eternity. As in Noah's time, the mercy of God makes it virtually certain that the huge number of souls will be given the time and knowledge necessary to save themselves if they wish. And afterwards many of the large number that will be saved (alas, not the majority) will recognize that only that chastisement saved them from drifting with today's corruption all the way down to Hell.

Still, it will be easy to be frightened by the explosion of the just anger of a majestic God. From miles and miles away the Israelites were terrified by a demonstration of his

power on the top of Mount Sinai (Exod. XX, 18). In our own times it will be well to recall the famous prayer of St Theresa of Avila (given here with a rhyming translation into English to facilitate memorisation):—

Nada te turbe, Let nothing fret you, Nada te espante, Nothing upset you. Todo se pasa, Everything falters, Dios no se muda. God never alters. La paciencia Patience withal Todo lo alcanza. Will obtain all. Quien a Dios tiene Who to God will cling Nada le falta. Can lack for no thing. Solo Dios basta. God alone is enough.

Sacred Heart of Jesus, I put in you all the trust I can lay my hands on. But help my lack of trust!

Kyrie eleison.

FOURTH TRIAL

No. CCXCI (291)

February 9, 2013

Against a fourth condemnation in Germany for “Holocaust denial,” the author has once more appealed. He is grateful for financial help.

A reader asks about my latest trial and condemnation for “Holocaust denial” by the Regional Court of Regensburg in South Germany on January 16. Readers will remember that my original offence was on November 1, 2008, to have told a Swedish interviewer for Swedish TV in the privacy of the sacristy of the German Seminary of the Society of St Pius X, but on German soil, that I believed neither that “Six Million Jews” died under Hitler’s rule in the Second World War, nor that one single Jew died in a “gas-chamber.”

For expressing these beliefs in Germany, where “holocaust denial” is a statutory crime, I was tried and condemned by the Regensburg Regional Court in 2010, and the punishment was to be a fine of

LIBERALS INNOCENT?

No. CCXCIII (293)

February 23, 2013

However perverse our age is, still men know when they are breaking God's law. Newsociety leaders know they are forsaking God's Society.

Four weeks ago "Eleison Comments" answered the question whether liberalism is as horrible as it is supposed to be in the affirmative: implicitly, liberalism is war on God. There remained the question whether the many liberals who deny they are liberals are right to deny it. The answer is surely that all of us today are so soaked in liberalism that few of us realize how liberal we are.

Liberalism in its broadest sense is man's liberating himself from the law of God, which a man does with every sin that he commits. Therefore in its broadest sense every sinner is a liberal, and so whoever admits he is a sinner must admit he is a liberal in this broad sense. However, it is one thing to break God's law while still admitting that God is God and his law is his law. Such a sinner is merely a practical liberal. It is quite another to break God's law while denying that God is God or that his law is his law. Such a liberal in principle is the liberalism of modern times.

It burst upon the scene with the French Revolution of 1789. The charter of that Revolution, the *Declaration of Human Rights*, was in effect a declaration of man's independence from God. From now on, if any man obeyed God's law, he was doing so purely by his own choice, and not as under any command or commandment of God. In that apparent obedience he would not be behaving like a liberal in practice, but underneath, in everything he did, he would be a liberal in principle. This is the modern liberalism of which Catholics today often accuse their adversaries. Are these adversaries right, almost as often to deny it? Subjectively, yes. Objectively, no.

Subjectively, yes, because ever since 1789 men have drunk more and more deeply of the false principles of the Revolution, so that if they are accused of liberating themselves from the law of God, they can sincerely reply, "What law? What God? What are you talking about?" To such an extent have God and his law been apparently wiped out. But objectively, no, because God and his law have most certainly not ceased to exist, and deep down inside themselves even modern men know it. It is

“inexcusable” to say that he does not exist (Rom. I, 20), and his law is written on all men’s hearts (Rom. II, 15), whatever they may say with their mouths. The “sincerely” just mentioned needs inverted commas – it is worth only what it is worth before God’s judgment seat.

Then may those authorities of the Society of St Pius X presently seeking to blend the Society into the Conciliar Church deny that they are liberals? Subjectively they are no doubt persuaded that they are doing their best for the Church, but objectively they are unrepentantly seeking to put Archbishop Lefebvre’s anti-Revolutionary work under the control of Church officials intent upon making the liberal Revolution triumph once and for all. They say we must rejoin the visible Church because that is the Catholic Church. But the Anglican “church” is still visible, all over England. Does that make it Catholic? And the present SSPX leaders cannot be unaware of how they distort and suppress words of the Archbishop to make him fit their vision of the Church.

The sad truth is that these liberals never really understood what the Archbishop was all about. While he was alive they were spellbound, like so many of us, by his Catholic charisma, but they never grasped that faith, which was to his charisma as root is to fruit. They loved the fruit – all credit to them for that – but not long after he was gone, the fruit without the root began to wilt and die. It was inevitable that unless they understood his faith, they would change his Society into their own. That is what we have seen and are seeing. Heaven help us!

Kyrie eleison.

DI NOIA, ANNOYER

No. CCXCII (292)

February 16, 2013

One may suspect that Newsociety headquarters are conspiring with Newrome to achieve an agreement. Priests disagreeing should protest.

Two months ago the Vice-president of Rome's Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei* addressed to the Superior General of the Society of St Pius X and to all its priests a letter of several pages, accessible on the Internet, which Fr. Lombardi as spokesman for the Holy See called a "personal appeal." The letter has been raising comments ever since. It is clearly the latest move in Rome's campaign to bring the SSPX to heel, and put an end to its 40-year resistance to the Conciliar Revolution. As Bishop de Galarreta said in October of 2011, even if the SSPX turns down Rome's offers, still Rome will keep coming back. Sure enough. But let us see briefly what Archbishop Di Noia has to say to "Your Excellency and dear Priestly Brothers of the Society of St Pius X":—

He begins by admonishing Society leaders, notably Fr Schmidberger, Fr Pfluger and Bishop Fellay (in that order) for giving interviews so critical of Rome as to call in question whether the SSPX really wants reconciliation with Rome. Moreover, doctrinal differences are as intractable as ever between the SSPX and Rome. So he calls for a new approach, focusing on unity instead.

Church unity is hindered by four vices and promoted by the four opposing virtues of humility, mildness, patience and charity. Dividers of the Church are enemies of God. All we need is love. Away then with "harsh and unproductive rhetoric." Let the SSPX fulfil its charism of forming priests, but priests who will be docile to the official Magisterium, who will preach the Faith and not polemics, and who will treat theological problems not in front of untrained layfolk but with the competent authorities in Rome. The Pope is the supreme judge of such difficult questions. In conclusion, Benedict XVI does want reconciliation. Bitterness must be healed. In Our Lord's words, "Let them be one." (End of the Archbishop's letter.)

Notice in passing how, typically for modern man and for modernists, the Archbishop brackets out the essential question of doctrine, but this letter's main interest lies

elsewhere: how could the Archbishop have dared to address it to all SSPX priests without prior collusion with SSPX HQ? It served him by forwarding the letter to all SSPX priests! Here is one indication amongst many others that there are contacts between Rome and SSPX HQ that are kept from public view. But the question then arises, what motive can SSPX HQ have had to give to the modernist Archbishop such privileged and dangerous access to all SSPX priests? Does it want them to become modernists also? Surely not! But it may well want to help Rome towards “reconciliation.”

By transmitting the Archbishop’s loving appeal, SSPX HQ gets the sweet message through to all SSPX priests without anybody being able to accuse HQ itself of going soft. On the contrary, the Roman letter makes them all see how nice the Romans are. True, there is a gentle rebuke to the SSPX leaders for not being nice, but that will serve to show how these are standing firm in defence of the Faith! Above all, the letter will have served as a trial balloon, to test the priests’ reactions. What are they thinking? Both Rome and Menzingen need to calculate at what point to go ahead with a “reconciliation” such as will carry with it a large majority of the priests, and not alienate so many that organized resistance to the New World Order religion will continue.

Dear SSPX priests, if you do not want to be swallowed alive by New Order Rome, I gently advise you to react. Let your Superiors know, as discretely as you like but in no uncertain terms, that you want nothing, but nothing, to do with Conciliar Rome, until it clearly abandons the Council.

Kyrie eleison.

GREC – I

No. CCXCIV (294)

March 2, 2013

A Parisian group of priests and laity, formed to reconcile Rome and the SSPX, is by-passing doctrine. It cannot achieve its aims.

Just over one year ago was published in France a little book of some 150 pages which has to be a big embarrassment for the leaders of a certain religious Society, because it shows how their promotion of union with the Newchurch goes back many years, at least to the 1990's. Of course if they are proud of that promotion, they will feel no embarrassment, but if they have for many years been disguising that promotion, then let at least readers of the little book open their eyes.

“For the Necessary Reconciliation” was written by a Newchurch priest, Fr Michel Lelong, no doubt because he for one is openly proud of the leading part he played in GREC's attempt to bring about the “necessary reconciliation” of Vatican II with Tradition, or of the Roman authorities with the Society of St Pius X. Ordained in 1948, and heavily involved in inter-religious relations even before Vatican II, he welcomed “with joy and hope” (does that ring a bell? – *Gaudium et Spes*?) the Council that would strive to relate the Church to modern times. One of the lay collaborators in his work was a distinguished French diplomat and high government official, Gilbert Pérol, French Ambassador to the Vatican from 1988 to 1992.

As a professional diplomat and practising Catholic, Pérol believed profoundly in reconciling the truly Catholic SSPX with the assuredly Catholic Vatican. How could there be such a clash between the two? Both were Catholic! The clash was not reasonable. So in 1995 he sketched out a solution in a brief text which would serve like a charter for what became GREC, a Parisian think-tank for Catholics, named from the initials of *Groupe de Réflexion Entre Catholiques*. Expressing the concern of millions of Catholics torn from the 1960's onwards between the Council and Tradition, Pérol's text deserves a moment's attention.

Not being a theologian, he says, he thinks that the present situation of Church and world requires that the problem of the divisions between Catholics following on the Council “should be stated in entirely new terms.” It is rather as a diplomat that he

proposes that on the one side Rome should admit that it has gravely mistreated the Tridentine rite of Mass, and it should suspend the excommunications of 1988, while on the other hand the SSPX must not totally reject the Council and it must recognize that Rome is still the highest authority in the Church.

In other words as a diplomat Pérol proposed that if only there were a little give and take on each side, then the agony could be emptied out of the clash between the Council and Tradition, and all Catholics could once more live happily ever after. Thus he and millions of other Catholics would no longer be faced with having to either abandon Rome for the sake of Tradition, or abandon Tradition for the sake of Rome. Lovely! Back to the comfort zone of the 1950's! But the 1950's are gone, and gone for ever. Then where is the flaw in his thinking?

It is at the very outset when he says he is no theologian. True, he may have been no professional theologian, but every Catholic must be an amateur theologian, or, better said, must know his catechism, because only in the light of its doctrine can he judge questions of the Faith. Our Lord's warning to discern between sheep and wolves (Mt. VII, 15–20) was not addressed only to professional theologians! So Pérol's renouncing "theology" in favour of diplomacy is yet one more example of modern man's failure to grasp the importance of doctrine. This failure is the most important lesson to be drawn from this book on GREC.

Kyrie eleison.

GREC – II

No. CCXCV (295)

March 9, 2013

The Parisian group wants everybody to be nice to one another. But where is the God of Truth amidst the human niceness?

Before we continue with the story of GREC, namely the Parisian group of laity and clergy meeting from the late 1990's onwards in pursuit of reconciliation between Vatican II and Catholic Tradition, we must consider the basic attitude of GREC participants. The Church's future depends on those Catholics who will understand GREC's error, i.e. how modern minds lose their grip on truth. To illustrate that attitude let us take at random four quotes, typical of dozens and dozens in the book *For the Necessary Reconciliation* by the Newchurch priest, Fr Michel Lelong, one of the founders of GREC. In a letter he wrote to the Pope in July of 2008 are to be found the first two quotes:—

"We also wish that the excommunications (of the four SSPX bishops in 1988) be lifted and that the SSPX recover its place within the Church to which it has so much to give. That is why we ask the authorities of the SSPX to put an end to the polemical statements and articles criticizing the Holy See." Comment: (Has that not happened over the last 10 years?) But if polemics are so bad, why were a number of Church Fathers – and Archbishop Lefebvre – so polemical? Polemics are only that bad if unity is that good. But unity is only as good as that around which it unites.

"In our society so tempted by materialism, indifferentism and sectarisms, we think that in response to your request, Holy Father, all Catholics must strive together to be faithful to Christ's recommendation, 'Be united so that the whole world may believe'." Comment: "United" around what? Around Catholic truth, or around the lie that Catholic truth is reconcilable with Vatican II? Then the primary and crucial question for Catholic unity is where Catholic truth is to be found. But GREC leaves questions of truth to the "theologians." So non-theologians can be saved by lies!?

This letter of Fr Lelong was so well received by Benedict XVI that GREC leaders and sympathisers wrote again a few months later. Here are two more quotes from the second letter to the Pope:—

*“For sure we were saddened that the Holy See’s recent proposals were not accepted by the SSPX authorities, but we know that to heal wounds amongst Catholics always requires generosity and patience to restore confidence on both sides and to make reconciliation possible.”*Comment: Are wounds only ever to be healed, and never inflicted? Did Our Lord not twice use a lash across the backs of the money-lenders in the Temple? There is a God, his honour is to be defended above all things, and men can be wicked enough to understand nothing but the lash, be it physical or verbal.

*“We think that lifting the excommunications would set in motion an irresistible process of drawing closer, with a view to an agreement between the Holy See and the SSPX, or at least an agreement with a large part of the SSPX priests and faithful.”*Comment: indeed the friendly contacts between Rome and the SSPX were setting such a motion in process in January of 2009, and only an outburst from within the SSPX of the most horrible heresy of modern times – “anti-semitism” – stopped that process. But either Catholic reconciliation with Vatican II is no problem, or one has to say that that outburst was providential, because it also stopped, at least for a while, the false reconciliation.

In conclusion, GREC, like millions of modern Catholics, above all else seeks unity, non-polemics, reconciliation, agreement, etc. But where does the God of truth figure amongst all these sweet sentiments? Is he a sugar-daddy who blesses all men’s lies, just so long as they lie in unison?

Kyrie eleison.

UNDIGNIFIED DIGNITY

No. CCXCVI (296)

March 16, 2013

A reader's multiple arguments defending Vatican II's religious liberty are refuted. Its liberating man from God is insanity.

A reader has argued in favour of the Vatican II teaching on religious liberty. Even if the subject has often come up in "Eleison Comments," her arguments are surely worth going through, because it is vital for Catholics today to grasp thoroughly the falsehood of that teaching. What the Council taught in paragraph #2 of its Declaration on Religious Liberty (*Dignitatis Humanae*), is that all men are to be free from all coercion by any other men or group of men when it comes to acting in private or in public in accordance with their beliefs. Moreover every human State must make this natural right into a constitutional or civil right.

On the contrary, all the way up to Vatican II the Catholic Church consistently taught that every State, as embodying God's civil authority over God's human creatures, is obliged as such to use that authority to protect and favour God's one true Church, the Catholic Church of the Incarnate God, Our Lord Jesus Christ. Obviously, non-Catholic States will be condemned rather for their lack of faith than for not giving civil protection to that faith. Likewise Catholic States may refrain from prohibiting the public practice of false religions where such prohibition will do more harm than good for the salvation of the citizens' souls. But the principle remains intact: God's States must protect God's true religion.

In fact the Conciliar teaching implies either that States are not from God, or that there is no one true religion of God. Either way it is implicitly liberating the State from God, and so putting the liberty of man above the rights of God, or, simply, man above God. That is why Archbishop Lefebvre said that the Conciliar teaching was blasphemy. And it is no use saying that the other paragraphs of *DH* contain good Catholic teaching. One gash by the iceberg was enough to sink the *Titanic*. *DH*#2 alone is enough to sink Catholic doctrine. But let us see the arguments in defence of the Council's teaching.

1 *DH* is part of the Church's Ordinary Magisterium, which must be taken seriously. *DH*

came from the Church's Magisters, or masters, yes, but not from the infallible Ordinary Magisterium, because DH contradicts the Church's traditional teaching, as shown above. 2 *DH merely makes clear human rights that are granted by natural law.* Natural law puts the rights of man below, and not above, the rights of God. 3 *DH does not negate the Catholic model for Church-State relations.* It most certainly does! Paragraph #2 liberates the State from its intrinsic obligation to the one true Church. 4 *DH is written in the context of the modern world where everybody believes in human rights.* Since when must the Church be adapted to the world, and not the world to the Church? 5 *DH does not teach that man has a right to error.* If God's State must grant a civil right to practise, in public, false religions, then God is being made to grant a right to error. 6 *DH is a plea to modern governments to grant half a loaf, which is better than no bread.* True Catholic doctrine is so logical and so coherent that to give away any of it is to give away all of it. And what sheep saved itself by offering itself to the wolf? 7 *Catholics must not retreat from the modern world into a doctrinal ghetto.* Catholics must do whatever they have to do, go wherever they have to go, in order not to give away the rights of God or compromise his honour. If that means martyrdom, so be it!

Kyrie eleison.

“YOU CHOOSE”

No. CCXCVII (297)

March 23, 2013

Words supposedly of Our Lord to a French woman in the 1960's and 1970's constitute a serious warning to the modern world.

What confusion reigns in the Church and so in the world! We see one after another the best of men, with perhaps the best of intentions, giving up the struggle and making the decision to resist no longer, to go with the flow, to follow the current, to do what everybody else is doing. Yet that flow remains godless, and it is condemned by God without appeal, because he does not change. No doubt he is right now appealing to the new Pope to do what is right, cost what it may.

Between 1966 and 1975 he seems to have appealed to a woman in France to get a French prelate to put in Paul VI's own hands a series of divine messages calling for the Pope to lead massive pilgrimages of penance to the famous basilica of Vézelay (and, from 1972, to restore the Tridentine Mass). The messages are given the title of the Lenten Chant, *Parce, Domine, Populo Tuo* (Spare, O Lord, Thy People), They come with no official authorization but they fit Holy Week. Readers who care to read these brief extracts can judge for themselves if they ring true:—

16-X-65: The world is on the brink of catastrophe. However, do believe that the entreaty in prayer of a few humble souls has great power over My heart.

3-III-68: Tell the Holy Father to sing imploringly the *Parce, Domine* with his arms held up in the form of a cross, in front of the crowds that he is to gather together in Vézelay.

2-III-70: If My appeal is not heeded, the waters of My wrath will drown everything. What weeping and groaning there will be at that moment, but it will be too late.

13-II-71: Tell the priests to call for prayer and penance amidst collapsing Christendom, and to set the example themselves. Otherwise there will be massacres on French soil. If you refuse to send up to My Father cries of humble repentant prayer, you will perforce send up cries of terror. You choose! 25-III-71: My little children, if you do not want processions of love, you will have processions of hate.

These are already starting. What more do you need to believe in My appeal to you?

28-IV-72:If they don't want to genuflect in front of the Blessed Sacrament, they will genuflect in the salt-mines! 10-VII-72:If the Pope does not do what I have asked for, divine Justice will come down heavily on the world, and you will have to undergo such suffering that if you knew the details now, you would be frozen with terror.

15-VII-72:I appeal to My faithful children. Am I to find only deserters? If you knew, my children, what awaits you, how you would hasten to fulfil My desires. But justice will soon be done. You will cry out to Me in your terror, but it will be too late.

6-XI-72:Were I to show you what awaits you, you would spend entire nights in prayer at My feet, to keep the terrible chastisement away.

13-VII-73: The laity are presently the hope of the Church. Pray for your unfaithful shepherds.

2-V-75:In the evil times coming, Christian families will have to get together and work out how to look after the needs of My faithful priests, who will have to exercise their ministry hidden from public view . . . It is back to the catacombs. There is no other way.

Parce, Domine.

HOLY SATURDAY

No. CCXCVIII (298)

March 30, 2013

As Our Lord was eclipsed on Holy Saturday, so Mother Church is going into eclipse today. Like Our Lady, we must not waver.

Holy Saturday in the life of Our Lord was that day between his appalling death on the Cross and his glorious Resurrection, when his human body, lifeless without its human soul, lay in the dark tomb, unseen to human eye. Our Lord's enemies seemed so successfully to have crushed him that the Incarnate God was in complete eclipse, and only the faith of Our Lady in her Divine Son remained unshaken. All his other followers she had to sustain, because even the most devout of them felt bewildered and lost.

Now as being the Mystical Body of Christ, the Catholic Church follows the life's course of his physical body. Down all its 2,000 years of history the Church has always been persecuted by the enemies of Christ, and in many parts of the world at various times it has been virtually wiped out. Yet surely it has never been going into complete eclipse like it seems to be doing today. God designed his Church as a monarchy, to be held together by the Pope, and we have just seen a Pope resigning, no doubt in part because he himself, mesmerized by modern democratic thinking, never fully believed in his own supreme office. Taking the papal tiara off his coat of arms, and signing himself always as "Bishop of Rome," whatever were his intentions when he resigned in February, he surely helped, humanly speaking, to undermine the divine institution of the Papacy.

Certainly by Benedict XVI's resignation and by the succeeding conclave the enemies of Christ will have been doing all they could for their part to undo the Papacy. By a just punishment of God for the universal apostasy of our age, they have received from him a great power over his Church. They have been working for centuries to get a stranglehold over the Vatican, and they are now entrenched there. With no intention of giving way to a pious little Society, they are, as Anne Catherine Emmerich saw in a vision 200 years ago, dismantling the Church stone by stone. Humanly speaking, today's followers of Our Lord have as little seeming hope as they had on the original

Holy Saturday.

But no more than Our Lord himself is the Catholic Church a merely human affair. In 1846 Our Lady of Salette said about our own times: "The righteous will suffer greatly. Their prayers, penance and their tears will rise up to Heaven, and all of God's people will beg for forgiveness and mercy and will plead for my help and intercession. And then Jesus Christ in an act of his justice and great mercy will command his Angels to have all his enemies put to death. Suddenly the persecutors of the Church of Jesus Christ and all those given over to sin will perish, and the earth will become desert-like. And then peace will be made, and man will be reconciled with God, Jesus Christ will be served, worshipped and glorified. Charity will flourish everywhere . . . The Gospel will be preached everywhere . . . and man will live in fear of God."

In other words, God will most certainly resurrect his Church from its present distress. When the eclipse becomes still darker, as it is sure to do, let us merely hold more closely than ever to the Mother of God, and let us resolve now not to weigh upon her then by our disbelief, as did Our Lord's Apostles and disciples on the first Holy Saturday. Let us undertake to rejoice her Immaculate Heart with our unshakeable faith in her Divine Son and his one true Church.

Kyrie eleison.

GREC – III

No. CCXCIX (299)

April 6, 2013

Newsociety priests closely involved in GREC's non-doctrinal attempt to solve a huge problem of doctrine are still pursuing their fantasy.

Wishing to put himself in the place of God, modern man seeks to replace God's order of the world with his own. But God's order is real, outside of and independent of man's mind. So modern man unhooks his mind from that reality, and selects from it only such pieces as he wishes to build into his own fantasy. Now the highest order of God's Creation is best expressed in his Church's doctrine. Therefore all churchmen or laymen today undergoing the influence of everything "normal" in the world around them suffer from a deep refusal or ignorance of the nature and necessity of doctrine.

Here is the essential problem of GREC, as presented in two previous issues of "Eleison Comments" (294 and 295). The Groupe de Réflexion Entre Catholiques was founded in 1997 in the salons of Paris to promote friendly meetings and exchanges between Catholics of Tradition and Catholics of the mainstream Church, in order to create a climate of mutual trust and respect which would facilitate a reconciliation between them, and an end to their unnecessary estrangement. Such a purpose gravely overlooks the importance of doctrine, not necessarily with malice aforethought, of which God is judge, but whatever foolish men may think, doctrine can no more be left out of account than can reality.

In Fr. Lelong's book on GREC, *For the Necessary Reconciliation*, he tells how two Society of St Pius X priests and its Superior General "made a decisive contribution to the launching and continuance of GREC." Even before it was launched, Fr. Du Chalard gave to Fr Lelong a friendly reception in his SSPX priory, and "in following years never ceased to support GREC in a discrete and attentive way." At the launching of GREC, Fr. Lorans, then Rector of the SSPX Institute in Paris and exercising from Paris a decisive influence from then until now on SSPX publications, welcomed the idea of "dialogue between Catholics," and very soon obtained from the SSPX Superior General in Switzerland approval for his participation in GREC. From then on Fr. Lorans played a leading part in all of its activities.

Those activities began on a small scale and in private. In May of 2000 was held GREC's first public meeting to which Fr. Lorans contributed, with 150 people attending. Meetings became more and more frequent, with SSPX priests participating. Church authorities at the highest level were regularly consulted and kept informed. Fr. Lorans for his part made possible "a contact of deepening trust" and friendly exchanges with the SSPX Superior General. From 2004 GREC meetings were opened wider still to the public, and in September of that year a "theological working group" was set up with Fr. Lorans participating, and another SSPX priest and a theologian from Rome, both of whom would later be taking part in the Doctrinal Discussions between Rome and the SSPX from 2009 to 2011. GREC may well have seen in these Discussions the realization of its fondest hopes – at last the theologians were meeting in a climate which GREC had done so much to create "for the necessary reconciliation."

Thanks be to God, the Discussions gave back to doctrine its proper primacy. They demonstrated that between Catholic and Conciliar doctrine is an unbridgeable gulf. But was GREC's way of thinking then blocked within the SSPX? Far from it! SSPX Headquarters switched overnight from "We pursue no practical agreement without a doctrinal agreement" to "There can be no doctrinal agreement, so we pursue a practical agreement"! Alas, the springtime uprising of protest last year from within the SSPX was smothered and confused again at the General Chapter of July, but SSPX HQ's continued pursuit of a practical agreement has hardly been smothered.

"Our help is in the name of the Lord," in particular in the Consecration of Russia. Nowhere else.

Kyrie eleison.

DOCTRINAL DECLARATION – II

No. CCC (300)

April 13, 2013

The seventh paragraph of the Newsociety's Doctrinal Declaration of last April equals the "hermeneutic of continuity," which is balderdash!

The *Doctrinal Declaration* of April 15 of last year, drawn up by the Superior General (SG) of the Society of St Pius X as a basis for the Society's reintegration into the mainstream Church, has emerged nearly one year later into public view. It was designed by the SG to please both the Conciliar Romans and Traditionalists ("It can be read with dark or rose-coloured glasses," he said in public). It did please the Romans who declared that it represented an "advance" in their direction. It did not please Traditionalists who saw in it (what they knew of it) such ambiguity as to represent a betrayal of Archbishop Lefebvre's stand for the Catholic Faith, to the point that they considered that the Romans need only have accepted it to destroy his Society.

In fact when the SG met the Romans on June 11 in Rome to receive their decision, he fully expected they would accept it. Numerous observers speculate that if they did not accept it, it was only because the intervening publication of the April 7 Letter of the Three Bishops to the SG warned the Romans that he would not be able to bring the whole Society with him into the bosom of their Conciliar Rome, as he may have given them to understand he would do, and as they wanted him to do. They did and do not want another split to start Tradition all over again.

Be all that as it may, space remains here for nothing but one major argument that the proposal of the *Doctrinal Declaration*, had it been accepted by Rome, would have destroyed the SSPX. Archbishop Lefebvre declared, and proved, that Vatican II was a break or rupture with previous Church teaching. On that premise arose, and rests, the Traditional Catholic movement. So, confronted by the on-going resistance of that movement to his beloved Vatican II, Benedict XVI proclaimed at the outset of his pontificate in 2005 the "hermeneutic of continuity," whereby the Council (objectively) contradicting Tradition was to be (subjectively) so interpreted as not to contradict it. Thus there would be no break or rupture between it and Catholic Tradition!

Now see the seventh paragraph (III, 5) of the *Doctrinal Declaration*. It declares that Vatican II statements difficult to reconcile with all previous Church teaching, (1) “must be understood in the light of Tradition entire and uninterrupted, in line with the truths taught by the Church’s preceding Magisterium, (2) not accepting any interpretation of those statements which can lead Catholic doctrine to be exposed in opposition or rupture with Tradition and that Magisterium.”

The first part here (1) is perfectly true, so long as it means that any Conciliar novelty “difficult to reconcile” will be flatly rejected if it objectively contradicts previous Church teaching. But (1) is directly contradicted by (2) when (2) says that no Conciliar novelty may be “interpreted” as being in rupture with Tradition. It is as though one said that all football teams must wear blue shirts, but football team shirts of any other colour are all to be interpreted as being nothing other than blue! What nonsense! But it is pure “hermeneutic of continuity.”

Now, do the soldiers holding the last fortress of the Faith that is organised worldwide realize what their Commander is thinking? Do they realize that his solemn declaration of SSPX doctrine shows him to be thinking like an enemy leader? Are they happy that they are being led to think like the enemies of the Faith? All ideas must be Catholic, while non-Catholic ideas will be “interpreted” as Catholic. Wake up, comrades! Enemy thinking is in Headquarters.

Kyrie eleison.

RESISTANCE RISING

No. CCCI (301)

April 20, 2013

A resistance of quality if not yet quantity to the Newsociety's sell-out to Newrome is arising in North and South America.

Another three-week journey on the western side of the Atlantic Ocean has just given me to see that the resistance to the collapse of the Society of St Pius X into the embrace of apostate Rome is rising, more in quality than in quantity (but Catholic quantity follows Catholic quality, and not the other way round). Traditionalists have been deliberately kept in the dark as to what is going on between the Society and Rome, but as they find out just how the true Catholic religion is being endangered, so a number of good men are reacting with seriousness and resolution.

I visited first of all Fr Jahir's community of some dozen religious in northern Brazil, behind the city of Salvador where Fr Jahir was a parish priest for many years. Having fled the Newchurch, he sees the situation of the Newsociety very clearly. He has founded his own community in the true Faith, and it is easy to imagine several of his men becoming in a few years' time valiant priests who will hold that Faith. I gave to one of them Tonsure and the first two Minor Orders, and then headed south to visit another Brazilian priest becoming famous for his staunch adherence to Tradition, as Archbishop Lefebvre understood it.

The Benedictine Dom Thomas is Prior of the Monastery in the mountains near Nova Friburgo behind Rio de Janeiro. It was founded in the 1980's by Dom Gérard as an offshoot from the Traditional Benedictine Monastery which Dom Gérard had also founded in France in the 1970's, with the encouragement and support of Archbishop Lefebvre. However, when the Archbishop consecrated bishops in 1988, Dom Gérard broke with him, took his monastery into the Newchurch, and crossed the ocean to do the same with the Brazilian monastery.

Here he ran into the resistance of Dom Thomas, who was still only a young monk, but who before becoming a monk had learned in depth from a famous Brazilian lay Catholic, Gustavo Corção, the wrongness of the Newchurch. With help from good laymen and with the support of Archbishop Lefebvre, Dom Thomas stood up to Dom

Gérard and saved the Monastery for Tradition. With such a clash behind him it is not surprising that Dom Thomas also sees very clearly the situation both of the Newchurch and of the Newsociety. In a tent set up outside the small Monastery church for the extra visitors to the Holy Week ceremonies, we celebrated with few priests but with all the essentials the Maundy Thursday Consecration of Holy Oils. These the Monastery can now supply for this year to priests in particular whose supply could be cut off by the Newsociety.

Then I flew north to visit three more centres of the Resistance being launched in the USA by the brave Frs Joseph Pfeiffer and David Hewko. Near Connecticut, in New Jersey and in Minnesota I was able to give Confirmations and conferences to Catholics suspicious of what is going on in the Newsociety. They had good questions, deserving of truthful answers.

Good news for benefactors in Euroland: the St Marcel Initiative has at last a RIB and an IBAN, based in France, to facilitate donations in euros to the St Marcel Initiative. To make a bank transfer from inside France use the following RIB: [write to letters@eleisoncomments.com for the number]; from outside France use the following IBAN: [write to letters@eleisoncomments.com for the number]. The St Marcel Initiative has just been able to give a little serious aid, much needed, to Dom Thomas' Monastery. He thanks all of you who have contributed to the Initiative.

Kyrie eleison.

GREC – IV

No. CCCII (302)

April 27, 2013

A reader complains of the “Comments” on GREC, but the problem remains – SSPX priests should have known better than to take part.

A lady having read the first “Eleison Comments” on GREC (EC 294, March 2) wrote to complain that I misrepresented GREC, the Parisian group of Catholics founded in the late 1990’s to bring together Traditionalists and mainstream Catholics so that they could think and talk peacefully with one another for the good of Mother Church. I am happy to correct errors of fact which she pointed out. I have no problem admitting personal faults of mine which she highlighted. However on one major point I must disagree with her.

As for the errors of fact, Mr Gilbert Pérol was French Ambassador to the Italian government, and not to the Vatican. Also he was not a “lay collaborator,” but a personal friend of Fr Michel Lelong, a White Father. Also GREC was launched not “in the salons of Paris,” but in the flat of the Ambassador’s widow, Mrs. Huguette Pérol, who, I was told, takes full responsibility for having founded GREC, purely to help the Church, and with the help of people “competent and concerned to be faithful to the Gospel and to Tradition.”

As for my faults, she wrote that I was “full of myself” and “ignorant,” that I lacked modesty and diplomacy, that I showed insufficient respect for the dead, and that I wrote with a sarcastic tone befitting neither an educated person nor a priest. Madam, how happy I would be if these were the worst faults for which I shall have to answer before God. Do pray for my particular judgment.

However, as to the sarcasm, let me plead that if I mocked the nostalgia of Catholics today for the Catholicism of the 1950’s, I was thinking not of Ambassador Pérol in person, but of the multitudes of present-day Catholics, who, not realizing why God allowed Vatican II to split the mainstream Church from Catholic Tradition in the first place, wish to return to that sentimentalized faith of the previous decade which led directly to Vatican II! Madam, the crucial point has nothing to do with subjective persons, it has everything to do with objective doctrine.

That is why I must disagree with you as to the competence of the people helping Mrs Pérol to found GREC. That a professional diplomat like Ambassador Pérol should have resorted to diplomacy to solve major problems of doctrine is misguided, but understandable. That a Conciliar priest like Fr Lelong should have encouraged such a diplomatic undertaking is graver, but still understandable, given how Vatican II undermined all doctrine by officialising subjectivism within the Church. What is much less easy to accept is the “competence and concern for the Gospel and Tradition” on the part of priests who were trained under Archbishop Lefebvre to understand the doctrinal disaster of Vatican II. Such priests should never have encouraged, let alone taken any active part in, an essentially diplomatic effort to solve an essentially doctrinal disaster, however well-intentioned that effort may have been.

And yet, even in their case the French proverb to some extent applies: “To understand everything means to forgive everything.” The Archbishop was of an earlier and saner generation. They are all children of the world shattered by two World Wars. All credit to them for resorting to his person for their priestly formation, and while he lived he raised us all up. But they never truly absorbed his doctrine, and so once he was dead they began within a few years to fall back. But he was right, and they, and GREC – forgive me, gracious lady – are wrong. Please God they may come right.

Kyrie eleison.

DOCTRINAL DECLARATION – II

No. CCCIII (303)

May 4, 2013

A still more detailed analysis of paragraph #7 of the Doctrinal Declaration of one year ago uncovers a terrible cunning with words.

Forgive me, dear readers, if I return to the seventh paragraph of the *Doctrinal Declaration* of April 15 a year ago. The *Declaration* was to serve as no less than a basis for all future relations between the Society of St Pius X and Rome. On June 13 (not 11) Rome refused it, so SSPX Headquarters may now have repudiated it, but it serves to show what the present SSPX HQ is capable of. As for the seventh paragraph, it is a masterpiece of confusion. These “Comments” three weeks ago (EC 300, April 13) explained in part with a twofold distinction, but the confusion requires a fourfold distinction to do it justice. Here is the complete paragraph:

Declaration III, 5: “The statements of Vatican II and the post-conciliar Magisterium with regard to the relation between the Catholic Church and non-catholic confessions and to the social duty of religion and the right to religious liberty, (1) the formulation of which it is difficult to reconcile with previous doctrinal statements of the Magisterium, (2) must be understood in the light of Tradition complete and uninterrupted, (3) in a manner coherent with the truths previously taught by the Church’s Magisterium, (4) without accepting any interpretation of these statements which can lead to Catholic doctrine being laid out in opposition to, or breaking with, Tradition and that Magisterium.”

The underlinings are my own, to highlight the trickery of the paragraph. Notice (1) how it is not the statements of Vatican II that are problematic, but only their “formulation.” We are already moving away from words meaning what they objectively say. Words float around, according to how they are subjectively “understood” (2), or “interpreted” (4). Our minds are being made to slip anchor from a spade being called a spade. There is suggested no objective impossibility of reconciling Conciliar nonsense with Catholic sense, they are merely “difficult” to reconcile subjectively (that is to say, in the darkened minds of backward Traditional Catholics).

Notice above all in (2) and (3) the subtle but crucial slide from “in the light of” to “in a

manner coherent with.” Truly understanding the Vatican II novelties “in the light of” Tradition is to understand that they are wholly irreconcilable. Understanding them “in a manner coherent with” Tradition is to understand them as though they are reconcilable. Our minds are being made to slide again, because “in the light of” and “in a manner coherent with” do not mean the same thing. Sure enough, (4) any subjective understanding of the novelties that makes them clash with Tradition and the age-old Magisterium is absolutely to be rejected.

Thus clause (2) may tip the hat to “Tradition complete and uninterrupted,” and so (2) could be aligned with Catholic sense, but (3) suggests modernist nonsense, and (4) drives home the nonsense. Thus the paragraph as a whole constitutes a most clever step-wise movement from a shadow of truth to the outright error of the “hermeneutic of continuity,” which is pure *Alice in Wonderland* – “Words mean what I say they mean,” thunders Humpty Dumpty.

Whoever wrote this paragraph, God knows. It may not have been the Superior General of the SSPX. But can anybody who studies it carefully deny that, as it stands, it is designed to lead minds from Catholic Truth into Conciliar error? It makes words dance like heretics make them dance, and heretics that make words dance make souls lose their faith and fall into Hell. Whoever was responsible for this seventh paragraph, let him be anathema!

Kyrie eleison.

MORE ENCOURAGEMENT

No. CCCIV (304)

May 11, 2013

A brief description of a one-week visit to Traditionalists in Germany, Switzerland and France indicates that truth is making its way.

The news from a one-week visit to Germany, France and Switzerland is encouraging. Certain leaders might do well to remember the famous words of Abraham Lincoln: “You can fool some of the people all the time, all the people some of the time, but not all the people all the time.” Fewer people all the time are being fooled by what is happening within the Newsociety of St Pius X.

The journey began in Germany where some people feared I might run into difficulties, but for four days I was not troubled in any way. A good young layman picked me up at Frankfurt’s huge railway station and drove me north to Brilon Wald to meet the half dozen Carmelite Sisters who have become famous throughout the world of Catholic Tradition for having separated themselves, for all the right reasons, from the SSPX in its present state. They are clear in mind, resolute and cheerful. As Mother Superior told me, their greatest sorrow is that for over 20 years no novice has persevered with them. The Carmelite Sisters are not being expelled from their present convent, as has been feared, but they are hoping to move south for greater local support. May God be with them. Their prayers are precious to all of us.

Then I was driven back south of Frankfurt to address a private meeting of some two dozen adults, mostly men, in a countryside setting. They listened attentively in the afternoon to an in-depth analysis of the background crisis of the New World Order and the Newchurch, and on the following morning to a presentation of the foreground problems in the Newsociety. There were plenty of good questions and a good deal of hearty singing from the compatriots of Beethoven. The springtime birds in the German trees were given a good run for their money!

Further south, in Munich, I met with an old friend and the two lawyers who will be going to bat for me at my fifth trial for denying the “Holocaust,” due to take place in Regensburg in September. They are well aware that national politics make a just verdict at the regional level virtually impossible, but they will do their best. Precisely

because the Six Million serve as a substitute Redeemer in millions of minds, I had no scruple in remunerating the lawyers from the St Marcel Initiative, but its funds are being depleted. Thank you for all and any help.

Then to the Black Forest in southwest Germany, where there is another community of half a dozen Sisters, likewise cheerful and resolved not to follow the present misdirection of the SSPX. Founded in 1988, they have recently finished building and decorating a beautiful chapel with some two dozen choir-stalls “as a sign of hope,” their chaplain told me. Girls, if you think you may have a vocation, here are two firmly anti-modern convents in Germany that you can try.

Lastly, one night in Switzerland, close but unknown to Écône, where they may have learned only afterwards that I passed by to meet a group of good layfolk. And one night in Paris where I learned to my delight that many SSPX priests in France have lost all trust in the present management of the SSPX. Let us be patient. Almighty God is fooled by none of us.

My next engagement is in London on May 19, when I should be addressing British Friends of Palestine on *Hamlet*. Why? In that play Shakespeare cries out with pain at the loss of England’s soul. Were England still Catholic, not only Palestine but the whole world would be better off.

Kyrie eleison.

ETERNAL DAMNATION? – I

No. CCCV (305)

May 18, 2013

How can a soul be damned for one single mortal sin? Because God gives to every one of us enough light and freedom to avoid Hell.

A reader has raised once more a classic problem that has arisen a few times, directly or indirectly, in these “Comments,” but it is so serious that it deserves to be treated again on its own. He writes: “I find it difficult to be the Catholic I want to be because of the doctrine of eternal damnation. I cannot seem to accept the idea that a soul could be tormented ceaselessly for all eternity. It’s just too horrible. There has to be some Catholic doctrine that it’s not so cut and dried.” In brief, how can even one soul be justly condemned to an eternity of frightful torment?

Notice that in a cave one can still visit in Segovia in Spain, a great Saint like St Dominic spent a night agonising in prayer over this question. But let us lay down immediately that there can be no question of putting Almighty God in the dock, as though he either deserves to be condemned or needs to be acquitted. If his Church teaches, as it does, that one mortal sin can condemn a soul to eternal hellfire, and if I disagree, then it is I that am wrong, and not his Church. Why am I wrong?

For either or both of two connected reasons. Either I do not grasp the greatness and goodness of God, which it is easy to do, because my little mind is finite and God is infinite. Or I do not grasp the seriousness of sin, which it is also easy to do, because sin primarily offends God, only secondarily myself and only in third place my neighbour. So if I fail to grasp the greatness of the God offended by sin, naturally I will not grasp the seriousness of sin.

The question then becomes, has the great and good God given to every human being that ever lived sufficient means during its short life on earth of knowing that he exists, that he can be offended, what basically offends him and how serious it is to offend him? The answer can only be affirmative on all four headings.

* I do not need supernatural faith to know the existence of God. Upright reason alone tells that behind all the good things in a man’s life is a Supremely Good Being.

Reason twisted out of true by pride or darkened by sin may not tell of this Being, but any twisting and darkening are my fault, not God's, and they deserve a punishment proportionate to all of the goodness which I have experienced in this life and which it was "inexcusable" of me (Rom. I, 20) not to ascribe to God. * The reality of free-will is an everyday experience, and every one of us has the natural light of conscience to tell us that we owe worship to the Supreme Being, and that to refuse that worship is to offend him. Such is the First Commandment, and it does not need faith to be known.

* Natural conscience also tells me of the other nine Commandments, which merely spell out the natural law, and it also tells me that to break them offends not only my neighbour but also, and even primarily, the Supreme Being. * And lastly, the cleaner my conscience is, the more clearly it tells me how serious it is to offend Him. The problem is that we are all sinners, and any sin helps to darken our conscience. But our sin is our own fault, not God's, and he is entirely just to punish us for how we darken our minds.

Alright, one may object, then all men are given in this life to know enough of God to deserve punishment after this life in proportion to how much they have offended him. But how can any mere man offend him so seriously that a punishment eternal and unimaginable is just? Let next week's "Comments" attempt to approach a mystery which is as deep in a way as God is deep.

Kyrie eleison.

ETERNAL DAMNATION? – II

No. CCCVI (306)

May 25, 2013

Eternal Hell is the infinite punishment for offending the infinite God. The difficulty lies in finite minds' grasping of the infinity of God.

It is idle to pretend that any of us human beings can fathom the mystery of one single soul's damnation, let alone that of the majority of human beings that live and die, but there are certain things that can be said which make it easier to accept that there is a mystery beyond our human possibility of knowing.

The key to the mystery is surely the infinite greatness, or the limitlessness, of God. If he is infinite, then to offend him is to commit an offence which is in a certain way limitless. But the only way for a finite human being to suffer infinitely is for the suffering to have no limit or end in time. Therefore there is a certain proportion between any grave offence committed against God, and an eternal punishment.

As for the infinity or limitlessness of God, it is not too difficult for our reason to grasp it in the abstract. Effects exist all around us which require a cause. But a chain of causes can no more go on for ever than an endless series of links in a chain can hang without a ceiling-hook. So there must exist a First Cause, which we call God. But if this First Cause were composite, or put together out of parts, then whoever or whatever put it together would have to have been prior to the First Cause – impossible. Therefore God is in no way composite, he can only be simple and pure Existence. But existence is not by itself, as such, limited. Any limits on God's being would have to have been put on him by a prior limiter, again impossible. Therefore the First Cause has no limits to his being, God is infinite existence.

In the concrete however, it is not so easy to get our minds around the infinity of God. Our human minds are working all day long on, with and from limited or finite creatures. Only when we turn our hearts and minds to God are we thinking of the infinite. Hence the common difficulty of prayer, because we can only think of what is limitless goodness by thinking of some limited goodness around us and then thinking away the limits. For instance God is as beautiful as a sunset, only infinitely more so.

It follows that the more we allow ourselves to be immersed in daily living, the less chance have our minds and hearts of grasping who or what is the God behind all the limited beings that make up our daily living. Contrariwise, the more we turn our minds and hearts to the knowing and loving of the unlimited Goodness necessarily behind all the limited good things of our daily lives, the better the access we will have to the mystery of God's infinite goodness and to the corresponding mystery of the ingratitude of so many of his human creatures.

Therefore to lessen – without remotely fathoming – the mystery of souls' eternal damnation, I need to follow St Dominic's example, and to pray. That does not mean fooling myself that God is right when he is in reality wrong. It means my getting to the truth, namely that he is right, and that I – am wrong!

St Ignatius' Spiritual Exercises greatly help to turn heart and mind to God. A Saint prayed along these lines: "O love, thou art not loved. Would that thou wert loved. Give me only to love thee as thou needest to be loved, and then do with me what thou wilt."

Kyrie eleison.

AUTHORITY CRIPPLED

No. CCCVII (307)

June 1, 2013

The desire for a new Society to replace the failing SSPX forgets how important official approval is to the founding of Catholic societies.

A number of good souls wish that a Congregation were founded to replace the Society of St Pius X. But while I share their fear that the SSPX is presently well on its way to disabling its formerly glorious defence of Catholic Faith and life, and while I therefore sympathize with their desire to see another Congregation like it to take its place, I do not believe that that is possible, and I think it is worth explaining why.

When in 1970 Archbishop Lefebvre wrote the charter of principles in line with which the future SSPX would be founded and would function, namely its Statutes, it was for him of great importance to obtain the official approval of them by the bishop of the Catholic diocese in which the original house of the SSPX was situated. As far as he was concerned, obtaining or not obtaining that approval meant all the difference between founding a Congregation of the Catholic Church and launching a private association of his own. He had every interest in founding a Catholic Congregation, far less interest in launching a private institution.

In fact when he went to see Bishop Charrière of the Diocese of Geneva, Lausanne and Fribourg to obtain that approval, he was not hopeful. The Conciliar Revolution was by then well under way, and it was directly contrary to what the Statutes projected. Providentially however, Bishop Charrière gave his approval, perhaps because he knew he was to retire soon afterwards. In any case the Archbishop returned exultant to Écône, and one report even tells of him waving the Statutes triumphantly in the air.

What that meant to him was that from then on, as far as he was concerned, he had the Church's authority to build a Congregation of the Church, and while a few years later Rome might attempt to take back that authorisation, the attempt was so intrinsically unjust according to Church law that the Archbishop never hesitated to continue exercising inside the SSPX all the authority of a classic Superior of a Congregation. That classic Catholic authority has such power that by harnessing it to

lies the Conciliar Popes have been able virtually to destroy the Universal Church, and by its being harnessed to a practical agreement with Conciliar Rome it is now virtually destroying the SSPX. On the other hand, as for authority over priests, nuns and laity outside the SSPX, Archbishop Lefebvre never arrogated to himself any other than that of a father, adviser and friend.

But the days of a Bishop Charrière are long since gone. How many sane bishops are there left in the mainstream Church? And how could any of them today approve of Traditional and anti-Conciliar Statutes? It is as though, just after the Archbishop got out of the Catholic castle with the Catholic Statutes in his hand, the Conciliar portcullis crashed down behind him. “They are mentally sick, but they have the authority,” as one of the four SSPX theologians said about the Roman theologians after the Doctrinal Discussions of 2009–2011. The SSPX is surely the last in line of the classic Congregations to be founded, at least until after the Chastisement. And it has not lasted long.

That is why, in my opinion, “What cannot be cured must be endured.” And that is why, right now, I envisage being little more than father, adviser and friend for any souls calling for a bishop’s leadership and support. Even that is task enough. May God be with us all.

Kyrie eleison.

HORRIBLE FALL – I

No. CCCVIII (308)

June 8, 2013

The fall of the SSPX corresponds to the unprecedented decadence of modern times, understood years ago by three truly Catholic minds.

The fall of the Society of St Pius X from what it was under Archbishop Lefebvre between 1970 and 1991 to what it has become over the last, say, 15 years, is little short of horrible. In a brief series let us see firstly why the horror is normal in the poor world around us, because to understand is to forgive, and we are all in need of forgiveness; secondly let us face the horror, not in order to be discouraged but on the contrary in order to gird our loins for worse almost certainly to come; and thirdly let us see what we can do to gird our loins, because beneath God's Heaven he cannot have left us with nothing that we can do (but in this connection it is important not to pour into the sand the little water that we have). Let us begin with three fine Catholic minds taking the measure of our age, to see why horror is today the norm.

In his great Encyclical letter of 1884 on Freemasonry, Pope Leo XIII marks how its evil principles advance from (#13) disregarding to (#14) injuring to (#15) destroying the Catholic Church, and then from (#16) the ruin of all positive religions to (#17) the ruin of all natural religion to (#18) the ruin of great natural truths such as God's Creation and Providence and the immortality of the soul. In the 21st century we have, logically, gone further still, namely to the ruin of the very notion of truth. Minds have been turned into mush, even the minds of Popes, Cardinals and Bishops.

In his great Encyclical letter of 1907 on Modernism, Pope St Pius X saw clearly the same ruin of all truth and thought by the modernists. It is beneath the dignity of Popes to shout, but in *Pascendi* Pius X uses the strongest expressions available to him to castigate the mind-rot by which the modernists rot out the Catholic Faith. In so many words he says that modernism is the end of the line. His dramatic warning obtained for the Church a reprieve of half a century, but with Vatican II the Faith-rot that he had flung out of the Church was by John XXIII and Paul VI made official doctrine within the Church! If Popes lose their minds, how should mere Superiors not do so?

A third Catholic mind, measuring the havoc wrought upon Catholic doctrine by Vatican II, was that of Romano Amerio, an Italian layman whose analysis of modern errors, *Iota Unum*, was highly praised by Archbishop Lefebvre. At one point Amerio says (could somebody find me the reference?) that if things continue on the same path as now, eventually it will become impossible to speak or write any more, all that will remain is to keep silent! This may seem unimaginable, but only recently a very good commentator in the USA, Dr Paul Craig Roberts, almost stopped writing, because it had seemed to him that there was no longer any public able or willing to think.

Truly, in this present dress rehearsal for the Antichrist, if these days were not shortened, as Our Lord says (Mt. XXIV, 22), we could all of us lose our minds and our faith. Then who may still feel inclined to throw the first stone at a Pope or Bishop today losing his mind?

However, while Our Lord forbids us to judge-condemn (Mt. VII, 1), because God alone has that perfect knowledge of all the circumstances which is necessary if one is to judge without error, at the same time Our Lord commands us to judge-discern between true shepherds and mercenaries, or between sheep and wolves in sheep's clothing (Mt. VII, 15). Such is our responsibility as Catholics, and that is why we will soon take another look at the horror now taking place within the Society of St Pius X.

Kyrie eleison.

ASIAN JOURNEY

No. CCCIX (309)

June 15, 2013

Since the SSPX leadership seems intent on selling out the SSPX, then there is plenty of work to keep a bishop busy all over the world.

A number of readers complained at the “Eleison Comments” of two weeks ago on authority being crippled. From its argument that on this side of the “imminent Chastisement” no further Catholic Congregation can be founded on a normal Catholic basis, they concluded that I believe there is nothing more for a bishop to do than to wait for God to intervene. But in that case why did I just spend two weeks in Asia, and why am I now in Ireland? Likewise they conclude that I will never consecrate another bishop. I say – God willing – just wait.

In fact there is a great deal for a bishop to do to visit and encourage souls striving to keep the Faith when Headquarters of the Society of St Pius X is obviously still intent upon taking it into the arms of Conciliar Rome. On June 17 Bishop Fellay wrote to Benedict XVI, “*I do intend to continue to make every effort to pursue this path (of reconciliation with Rome) in order to arrive at the necessary clarifications.*” And in the same vein, “*Unfortunately, in the present situation of the Society*” Rome’s counter-proposal of June 13 to his Doctrinal Declaration of mid-April “*will not be accepted.*” Then it would have been fortunate if the Society had accepted Rome’s terms?

Against this written evidence (made public by Headquarters) of Bishop Fellay’s on-going determination to sell out the Archbishop’s Society, we have quotes of his to the French District Superior that the “*unfortunately*” he only wrote “*for the sake of the Pope,*” and to the Carmelite Mother Superior in Belgium that he “*never intended to pursue a practical agreement with Rome.*” Alas, Bishop Fellay has such a track-record for adapting his words to his audience that quotes like these by no means disprove his intention to sell out the Archbishop’s Society. His astonishing ability to move the mental furniture around in his mind deserves an “Eleison Comments” all on its own, but in the meantime is it any wonder if what is coming to be called the “Resistance” is rising spontaneously all over the world?

Between May 24 and June 6 I visited with Fr Chazal a good part of his flock of some 400 souls, and I gave over 50 Confirmations in South Korea, the Philippines and Singapore. Fr Chazal is a character. He has brilliant insights and is very funny into the bargain. If ever you meet him, ask him to do his imitation of an Indian politician (he says the Indians are tough, and “can take it”).

In South Korea the Society’s change of direction caused a harsh split, with the result that the donor of the original chapel merely donated another. I had the pleasure of performing the marriage of the donor’s daughter. In the Philippines, just as I arrived, an older priest who fled the Newchurch years ago to work with the Society was fleeing the Newsociety to work with the Resistance. He looks like being entrusted with the beginnings of a seminary which Fr Chazal wants to launch, and he will in addition have his work cut out for him in centres throughout the central Philippines. In Singapore, a show-case in the East of Western-style materialism, still a good Chinese family with their friends have a firm grip on the change from the Society to the Newsociety. Truth will undermine this ExSPX, as Fr Chazal calls it, just as truth is undermining the Newchurch of the Novus Ordo.

Here are many souls to sustain on their way to Heaven. Do I have any candidates offering themselves for consecration as bishops?

Kyrie eleison.

HORRIBLE FALL – II

No. CCCX (310)

June 22, 2013

Is horror too strong a word for the fall of the SSPX? No, because souls are being gravely endangered by its infidelity to its Founder.

“Horror” may seem too strong a word for the change of direction within the Society of St Pius X that at last became clear one year ago. However, if Hell is horrible; if one cannot avoid it without the faith; if the Faith came into grave danger in a Church disabled by Vatican II, but a fortress of the true Faith was miraculously established within that disabled Church; and finally if that fortress is now also being disabled, then “horror” may not be too strong a word.

The SSPX has not yet fallen completely, but it has fallen a long way and it may fall all the way. The leadership that has skilfully promoted that fall over the last 15 years is still in power. It followed Archbishop Lefebvre while he lived, but it never understood, or it chose to cease understanding, why he founded the Society in the first place, namely to resist the downfall of Conciliar churchmen seeking to bring the Church into line with the glamorous but corrupt modern world. Once he was no longer there, these leaders were all too soon re-possessed by the glamour.

Right now they are dragging down with them a number of older SSPX priests, and they are deforming the younger ones. As for the older priests, just like after Vatican II, those shaped under the Archbishop can be in torment from the Newsociety’s bending them out of shape, unless and until they make the decision to go with the flow, but thereupon their conscience has to be anaesthetized. As for the younger priests, just like after Vatican II, having been normally mis-shaped in the new direction, only by themselves can they find the old direction, because they are not being taught what the Archbishop was really about. In effect, the SSPX seminaries are slowly being turned into newseminaries. Care must be taken in recommending them for vocations.

And towards the top of the SSPX? Here is the recent thinking of one who is thoroughly familiar with the doctrinal stand of the Archbishop. For a long time he was its defender, but since the Doctrinal Discussions of 2009 to 2011 proved that Rome was persevering in its doctrinal error, now he too, in 2013, approves of the

Society's collapse of principle at the Chapter of 2012 when it renounced a doctrinal agreement and set conditions for a merely practical agreement. Yet he is glad that in practice the collapse bore no fruit! Surely this was only because the Romans did not yet think the collapse was complete enough, yet he looks forward to the SSPX leaders renewing contacts with the new Pope, as though, having half collapsed, they do not risk collapsing completely when they crawl back to Rome in pursuit of canonical recognition for the SSPX.

What has happened to his mind? Just like many good priests under the tyrannical Paul VI after Vatican II, he has loosened it from divine doctrine and is making it go with the human flow. His conscience cannot be easy, but probably his will is getting set upon preferring the apparent good of the SSPX to the real good of the Faith, which is incompatible with submission to its powerful enemies. By pronouncing his solidarity with the Society leaders who want such a submission, he may not lose the faith himself, but by his new softness towards the Roman apostates he risks at the least making it somewhat easier for a number of other souls to begin losing the true faith.

As for the SSPX leaders, they are mired in duplicity because they still have to deceive themselves and others that they are faithful to the old religion of God and of Archbishop Lefebvre, when in reality they are wanting to belong to the mainstream Church dedicated to the new religion of man. The loss of souls and the duplicity are a double horror.

Kyrie eleison.

AUTHORITY CRIPPLED – II

No. CCCXI (311)

June 29, 2013

Four arguments in favour of the “Resistance” being organized are given answers. God may want of us doctrine rather than organization.

Again I am being urged by a valiant participant in today’s Catholic “Resistance” to put myself at the head of it. The reason given continues to be that I am the only bishop yet taking any part in this movement of opposition to the internal collapse of the Society of St Pius X. But God gave the dying breath of true Church authority to Archbishop Lefebvre, whose successors have cruelly abused it. Why should he give it again? The crisis of the Church has far advanced between the 1970’s and the 2010’s. At the risk of annoying many of you, here are the good soul’s main arguments, with answers which I propose to anybody but impose on nobody –

*1 The wide diversity of opinion amongst Resistance priests confuses the laity.** But to control opinions requires authority (see above). And maybe Catholics deserve to be confused after so many blindly followed Vatican II, and are now blindly following the SSPX. Maybe God has had enough of blind obedience. Maybe he wants Catholics to use their heads and think for themselves, and not just blindly “obey,” as a lazy way to Heaven.

*2 In particular there is confusion over whether to jump ship, i.e. stop attending SSPX masses.** But why should one opinion fit all cases? All kinds of different circumstances can bear on such a question. Granted, to stay with the SSPX on its present false course involves a real danger of gradually sliding, but souls need sacraments, and by no means all SSPX priests are yet traitors. In France recently the first edition of a 350-page book, 90% of which consists of quotations from Archbishop Lefebvre, sold out in two weeks. It was put together by an SSPX priest, Fr. François Pivert. That is a positive sign of hope. God bless him!

*3 The friction between Resistance priests could make the Resistance self-destroy.** There has always been, and there always will be, personal friction amongst priests. Doctrinal friction is much graver. It is doctrinal fidelity that mainly held the SSPX together until now, and doctrinal infidelity that is now destroying it. It is doctrinal

fidelity that will guarantee our one and only Faith which is the basis of whatever will survive of Catholicism in the Church, or in the SSPX, or in the “Resistance.”

4 There is no Church without a head or hierarchy. God wants us organized.*

Normally indeed there is no Church without head or hierarchy, but modern man has created an abnormal situation. Whereas the pagan centurion in the Gospels (Mt.VIII, 6–10) had a natural sense of how to command and how to obey (the two go together), “democratic” man has, in the name of liberty, wilfully unlearned how to do either. Thus arbitrary commands and excessive obedience are presently destroying the SSPX, as they have largely destroyed the mainstream Church. This is because both rulers and ruled lack the sense and love of that objective truth which is above both of them, and which when heeded has no difficulty in harmonizing their authority and obedience. Perhaps God wishes us to pursue doctrine rather than organization.

In conclusion, this exceptional trial of the Church will last for as long as God needs it to last for the purification of his Church. Meanwhile in the early 21st century there seems to me to be just not enough Catholic straw left to make a Catholic brick like the SSPX of the late 20th century. Patience. God will have his way. It is his Church, and he is looking after it. Patience.

Kyrie eleison.

LIVELY DEBATE

No. CCCXII (312)

July 6, 2013

When normal authority or jurisdiction fails in the Church, supplied jurisdiction can take its place, but it is less clear and so not as strong.

The problem of crippled authority (see these “Comments” of June 1 and 29) is rousing some lively reactions amongst readers. On the one hand valiant Catholics tell me that I AM a bishop, therefore I must ACT as a bishop by taking command of the “Resistance” movement. On the other hand a valiant priest with long experience of “sedevacantism” warns me not to let loose parallel churches by consecrating any more bishops, except in the case of World War, physical persecution or paralytic old age (well, there are those who would claim that the last has already set in . . .).

Of course the problem goes back to Vatican II, when at the bottom end of a 700-year slide the Conciliar churchmen by abandoning Church doctrine split Catholic Truth from Catholic Authority, and by so doing so discredited official Church authority that souls like those mentioned above no longer see the need for it. But central Church authority, given the natural diversity and original sin of all mankind, is absolutely necessary to ensure Church unity (and therewith survival) not only in the Truth but also in the sacraments and in Church government.

That is why a bishop or priest needs not only the sacramental power of his Orders, power he can never lose for all eternity, but also the power of jurisdiction, which is the power of saying (dictio) what goes, or what is right (ius, iuris). This second power does not go with his Orders, and he cannot give it to himself, he can only receive it from on high, from a Church Superior, ultimately from the Pope, and the Pope from God. Hence when valiant souls tell me that I AM a bishop (by my Orders) so that I am delinquent if I do not ACT as such by telling (dictio) the “Resistance” what to do (ius), most likely they are confusing the two distinct powers of the bishop.

However, they may be instinctively hitting upon another doctrine of the Church and of common sense, namely that of supplied jurisdiction: in an emergency where for whatever reason the Superiors are not providing the jurisdiction needed for the salvation of souls, the Church supplies it. For instance, a priest may have no

jurisdiction as is normally needed to hear Confessions, but if a penitent asks him to hear his Confession, then in case of need the priest may hear it and the sacrament will be valid. Now for sure and certain the vast emergency created in the Church by Vatican II has even been aggravated by the notorious mid-April Doctrinal Declaration from SSPX HQ, which is documentary proof of the crumbling of the last standing fortress of the true Faith.

But supplied jurisdiction has a weakness, because not being official, it is much more open to dispute. For instance, Conciliar Rome denies that there is any such thing as a Church emergency created by Vatican II, and they put corresponding pressure, all too successful, on the Society of St Pius X to submit itself to Conciliar authority. Such is the need for authority to be official. Even Archbishop Lefebvre lost maybe a quarter of the priests that he ordained, because he had no power to stop them from simply walking away. Such is this unbelievable crisis of the Church. So if a priest or layman asks me to give him commands, he may himself dispute it a few months later, or as soon as he receives what he considers to be a command he need not obey.

But the crisis remains real, and it is only going to get worse until God intervenes to bring the Pope to his Catholic senses, which God will do when enough Catholics are begging him to open the Pope's eyes. Between now and then the sharpening emergency is set fair more and more to fortify unofficial authority, but may Almighty God help us to avoid unnecessary anarchy.

Kyrie eleison.

RESISTANCE ADVANCES

No. CCCXIII (313)

July 13, 2013

The Episcopal consecrations' 25th Anniversary was commemorated equally by the "Resistance" in the USA, by the SSPX in Écône.

The Silver Jubilee celebration in the USA of the 1988 episcopal consecrations was a great success. A dozen priests with one bishop celebrated two pontifical Masses on June 29 and 30 in the rectory garden of Father Ronald Ringrose in Vienna, Virginia, with some 250 to 300 faithful attending each Mass. Liturgically the ceremonies may have left somewhat to be desired, because no parish has the resources of a fully operational seminary. However, much more important, the mood of the people was tranquil, with no bitterness or anger in sight, only a clear understanding that something has gone seriously wrong with the Society of St Pius X, and that to keep the Faith they must do something about it. Many had come long distances to attend, even from abroad.

On the day before, Father Ringrose hosted a day-long meeting inside his rectory for the dozen priests coming from Brazil, Canada, Colombia, England, France, Mexico and the United States. No extra organization was formed, nor was any further administrative mechanism put in place, but another Declaration was arrived at, concluding with a long quotation from Archbishop Lefebvre about the rebuilding of Christendom from ground level upwards. The mood of the priests was like that of the people, tranquil and resolute, with a unity of purpose in the simple determination to rescue what they can of what the Society leadership is now betraying.

Betraying? But did not on June 27 the three other SSPX bishops, Tissier, Fellay and de Galarreta, also issue a Declaration which seemed in large part to revert to what the SSPX has always stood for? Be careful. As the Latins said, "the poison is in the tail." The 11th of the 12 paragraphs states that the three bishops mean to follow Providence "either when Rome returns to Tradition . . . or when she explicitly acknowledges our right to profess integrally the faith and to reject the errors which oppose it."

Now Father Ringrose has been for the SSPX in the USA a comrade in arms for some 30 years, but he is no longer keeping it company on its new and suicidal path. Here is

what he wrote in his parish bulletin about the frame of mind expressed in this 11th paragraph:

“So even if Rome remains modernist, take us in anyway. We will be satisfied to be just another of the Conciliar pantheon, along with the heretics, ecumaniacs, pantheists, or whatever else is there. The Declaration sounds as if there has been a shift back to what the SSPX always stood for, but the door to a deal (between the SSPX and Rome) remains open. Nothing has really changed. It just sounds different. The contents of the can remain the same. The label on the outside just looks a little more like Archbishop Lefebvre.”

And the people seem to be voting with their feet. Reportedly there were only 200 to 300 people attending the Society’s own small-scale Silver Jubilee celebration in Ecône, and reportedly nigh on half the chairs were empty at Ecône’s annual priestly ordinations. It certainly seems as though the betrayal is making the Society steadily weaker while, as priests and faithful wake up to what is going on, the Resistance is going to grow stronger and stronger.

Kyrie eleison.

LONG-RANGE FORECAST

No. CCCXIV (314)

July 20, 2013

In 1994 one of the four SSPX bishops foresaw the possibility of the SSPX not holding strong but going over to Conciliar Rome.

Nearly 20 years ago, a certain bishop of the Society of St Pius X showed that it was possible to foresee the betrayal of Archbishop Lefebvre's SSPX which nearly happened in 2009 and 2012, and which still risks happening. Disturbed by the self-admiration and lack of seriousness which he had observed at the SSPX's recent elective General Chapter, here is a summary (with a few direct quotes) of what he said in the Society's house in Le Brémien, France, on 17 July, 1994 (See on the Internet: *Un évêque s'est levé le Brémien*, and you should find the original text in French).

It would be nice to be able to say that in the SSPX we are opening houses everywhere, we are building, we are entering new countries, we have vocations, that everybody is nice and sweet and young and enthusiastic, that we have four bishops, and so on. "But why should the SSPX have any special protection against the forces unleashed today which have swept away thousands of excellent bishops and priests in the mainstream Church? (. . .) What are the Society's qualities, what are its guarantees?" Youth, oh yes, youth is nice, good-looking, physically strong, but what about age, experience and the wisdom of years? How can youth be expected to be wise?

In the 1950s and 1960s the Church appeared to be in good health, heroically resisting the onset of the post-war world. In England and the USA, there were huge numbers of conversions each year, so that the world could seem to be on the point of converting to the Catholic faith. But what happened? Exactly the opposite. With Vatican II, the truth stopped fighting and the Catholic Church surrendered to the modern world.

So let me give you a parallel scenario for the Society. In the 1990s this lovely little Society with all its marvelous little priests is heroically resisting the failings and betrayals of the official Church. There are conversions, and people are realizing that the new Church is false and non-functional, but just when the official Church seems to be on the point of surrendering, what might we see? I do not say we shall see it, but what might we see? The Society surrendering and going over to the official Church. If

the Universal Church could collapse, why not all the more a tiny Society?

And here is another consideration. Before Vatican II every Catholic Order and Society had above it the Congregations of the Roman Curia so that “if something went wrong in a Society, not excluding a failure on the part of its leaders, something always humanly possible, then one could always appeal to Rome and Rome could intervene. In olden days it would generally intervene for the best, whereas today it generally intervenes for the worst, so now “it is better not to be under Rome, but watch out, there is a price to be paid, namely that there is nobody above us, and so our General Council, our little Superior-General, are the ceiling! Danger!” The Society is thrown back on its own resources. Now Archbishop Lefebvre was 65 years old when he founded the Society. But how many old men with long experience does the Society have in 1994?

In brief why should the Society be spared the problems of the Universal Church? I do not want the Society to break up, and please God, I shall do nothing to help it do so, but I can only say I would not be surprised if it did break up. God may preserve it, but He may also allow it to go the way of all flesh, to make us realize how little we are capable of by ourselves. We need wisdom, and special help from God.

Kyrie eleison.

CONTINUING DAMAGE – I

No. CCCXV (315)

July 27, 2013

Bishop Fellay may have politically withdrawn his infamous Doctrinal Declaration of a year ago, but he is not retracting it doctrinally.

When people wish to defend the very bad Doctrinal Declaration (DD) officially submitted by the Society of St Pius X to the Roman authorities in mid-April of last year as the basis for a practical agreement between Rome and the SSPX, they will often argue that since Rome refused the DD, the DD is of no further interest and may be forgotten. But in this month's issue of the "Recusant," newly arisen magazine of the Resistance in England, there appears a contrary argument which deserves careful attention. Here it is, either quoted directly from the original, or summarized:—

"The DD, as both its name and its contents make clear, is a statement saying that a number of doctrinal positions on questions of the greatest importance in the present crisis in the Church are acceptable to the SSPX. The problem is that several of the positions expressed in the DD are not acceptable." For instance the SSPX's General Chapter of last July was told by a leading theologian of the SSPX that "This Declaration is (. . .) profoundly ambiguous and sins by omission against the duty to denounce clearly the principal errors which are still raging within the Church and are destroying the faith of Catholics. As it stands, this Declaration gives the impression that we would accept the 'hermeneutic of continuity'." "The harm done by the DD is therefore that of a doctrinally dubious public statement. Nor has it, as such, been "withdrawn" or "renounced." In fact Bishop Fellay consistently refuses to admit that there is anything doctrinally dubious about his Declaration. At the very most he admits to having tried to be "too subtle," but he does not admit that such subtlety is highly objectionable in matters pertaining to the defence of the Faith. Bishop Fellay complains that the whole problem is that he "has not been properly understood" even by theologically very skilled members of the SSPX. He allows, among others, Fr Themann in the USA to defend the Declaration in public conferences that have been recorded and are being distributed among the faithful."

It is true that matters might have been worse if Rome had accepted the DD, but that

does not lessen the standing damage wrought by the DD's manifestation of what is doctrinally acceptable to the SSPX. For if Bishop Fellay says that he "withdraws" and "renounces" the DD, he certainly seems to mean no more than that it was inopportune at that moment, as being liable to cause division in the SSPX. "He has never as much as suggested that the DD is doctrinally dubious and unacceptable. And that is where the real issue has been all along, and that is the issue that is far from being solved: the Superior General seems to refuse to make any unambiguous profession of the SSPX's position."

In conclusion, the scandal caused by the DD has still not been repaired "Trying to downplay the seriousness of the matter for the purpose of maintaining or regaining peace and quiet among the faithful risks encouraging the mentality that doctrine does not matter all that much, as long as things run smoothly and we can keep the true Mass, etc." Such downplaying will only make the scandal worse (End of the article in the "Recusant").

This article states very moderately the problem of the DD not being publicly recanted or retracted by Bishop Fellay. But how can any Catholic Congregation keep and serve the Truth when it is led by a Superior who so obstinately plays at ducks and drakes with the Truth? If the SSPX is a lifeboat, either it gets rid of this deluded Captain who constantly seeks to drill holes in the floor of the lifeboat, or the SSPX turns into a deathboat. May God in his mercy open the SSPX's eyes.

Kyrie eleison.

CONTINUING DAMAGE – II

No. CCCXVI (316)

August 3, 2013

Nor does the three bishops' Declaration of June 27 of this year clear up the problem. It remains wide open to a false agreement with Rome.

Besides arguing that the Doctrinal Declaration of mid-April last year was refused by Rome and so is of no further interest, people claiming that there has been no significant change in the Society of St Pius X also resort to the three bishops' recent Declaration of June 27, which was obviously designed to reassure people that the SSPX lifeboat is undamaged and still perfectly seaworthy. However, souls wishing not to drown need to take a closer look.

It is the 11th paragraph which has become notorious. In brief, the bishops here state that they intend in the future to follow Providence, whether Rome soon returns to Tradition, or it recognizes explicitly the right and duty of the SSPX to oppose in public the Conciliar errors. Now this "whether" clause is out of the question because nothing short of a divine intervention is going to make the enemies of God, firmly established within the Vatican, let go of their Council. We come to the "or" clause. What can the bishops have meant by Rome "explicitly recognizing" the "right and duty" of the SSPX to oppose the Council?

The obvious meaning is that Rome would grant to the SSPX some official status within the mainstream Church, or some form of canonical regularisation. Some such recognition is obviously what the SSPX leaders have been striving for ever since they adopted the ideas of the Parisian think-tank, GREC, well over ten years ago. But when those leaders in April of last year largely accepted Rome's terms for such a recognition, they created such a storm of protest within the SSPX that they were forced to pretend that they no longer want any such recognition based on the mid-April terms. Then what can the "or" clause of June 27 mean?

Within a few days the French District Superior put to them exactly that question. He was told that the "or" clause does not necessarily entail any official recognition, but merely the eventuality of a weak but Catholic Pope being on the one hand Catholic enough to recognize the SSPX's "right and duty," etc., but on the other hand too weak

and isolated within Rome to be able to impose on the Romans any official recognition, etc. And the District Superior at least appeared to be content with this answer when he immediately transmitted it to the priests of his District.

Well, knock me over with a feather! Firstly, who, just reading the text of June 27, could ever have guessed that this was what the bishops had in mind? And secondly, what in the text of June 27 excludes a range of other possibilities that the bishops would accept in the name of “following Providence”? Given that on June 17, 2012, Bishop Fellay wrote to Benedict XVI that he would continue to do all he could to pursue a reconciliation between Rome and the SSPX, what in the text of June 27 excludes the cunning Romans eventually making to the bishops such an offer of reconciliation that – always in the name of “Providence” – they could not refuse?

Good luck to anyone who accepts the interpretation of the “or” clause given to the French District Superior. However, there are many of us who will remain unconvinced that the leadership of the SSPX has given up on its mad dream of reconciling irreconcilables. Until clear proof to the contrary, we will assume that those leaders remain, however unwittingly, intent upon turning the SSPX lifeboat into a deathboat. And when everyone drowns, they will make it all the ocean’s fault!

Kyrie eleison.

REAL CANONISATIONS?

No. CCCXVII (317)

August 10, 2013

How can the Newpopes John XXIII and John-Paul II be canonized?

Because the Newchurch will be newcanonizing its Newsaints.

“What do you think of Pope Francis’ intention to “canonise” John-Paul II and John XXIII next spring? Is it not a way of “canonising” Vatican II? And does that not raise the question of authority, given that all the manuals of theology prior to Vatican II teach that the Pope is infallible when he pronounces a canonisation?” Such was the serious question (slightly modified) put to me recently by a journalist of Rivarol. I answered along these lines:—

The determination shown by the heads of the Conciliar Church to canonise the Conciliar Popes demonstrates the firm will of the enemies (at least objective) of God to be done with the Catholic religion and to replace it with the new religion of the New World Order. Thus to a Newchurch correspond Newsaints to be fabricated by a process of canonisation which has been dismantled and “made new.” As is always the case with modernism, the words remain the same but the content of the words is quite different. Therefore Catholics who have the true Faith need not worry one little bit whether these Newcanonisations are infallible or not. They are proceeding from the Newchurch, which is a dummy of the Catholic Church.

But then what is this dummy? That is a delicate question, because one easily gets accused of being a “sedevacantist,” which is a word that nowadays frightens Traditionalists almost as much as the word “anti-semitic.” But what we need is to concentrate on reality by “judging just judgment and not according to the appearance,” as Our Lord says (Jn. VII, 24). We must not let ourselves be misled by appearances, by emotions or by words. Today for instance, are not schools becoming centres of unlearning instead of learning, hospitals places of killing instead of healing, police instruments of oppression instead of protection, and so on?

Thus by what Sister Lucy called a process of “diabolical disorientation,” the churchmen have become agents of lying instead of the Truth. They have allowed their

minds and hearts to be taken over by the ideas and ideals of the Revolution, that radical and universal uprising of modern man against his God and Creator. Yet these objective traitors (they can still mean in their hearts to be serving God – Jn. XVI, 2) are still churchmen in the sense that nobody else than they is “sitting on the chair of Moses,” in Our Lord’s words (Mt. XXIII, 2). The Pope is sitting there.

In other words the dummy Church in question is the Church occupied not by men who are not churchmen, but by churchmen whose hearts and heads are occupied by more or less of a new religion which is absolutely not Catholic. But notice the “more or less.” Just as rot does not take over an apple all at once, so the dummy church, or the Newchurch, may be in the process of eclipsing the Catholic Church, but within it are still some bishops, many priests and a host of layfolk who can have kept the Catholic Faith up till now. They are on a slippery slope, highly dangerous for their faith, but one cannot say that they are outside of the true Church. God knows.

So when it comes to the authorities of the Newchurch, I would treat their authority as one does that of a family father who has gone temporarily mad. One pays no more attention to his madness than to be watching out for the moment when it comes to an end, but in the meantime one does not cease loving him or even respecting the authority intrinsic to his fatherhood. So help me God.

Kyrie eleison.

PATHOLOGICAL CONDITION

No. CCCXVIII (318)

August 17, 2013

“Pathological” is a modern word used to name a maladjustment to reality. Catholics must recognize how widespread this condition is.

The great Queen of Spain, Isabella the Catholic, is reported once to have commissioned a painting that would show a priest at the altar, a woman giving birth and a criminal being hanged. In other words, let everyone do what they are meant to do, and not something else. But these “Comments” suggested last week that today people are not being what they are: teachers often no longer teach, doctors often no longer heal, policemen often no longer protect, and – worst of all, I could have added – priests are often no longer men of God. A modern word used by an Italian friend to describe this maladjustment to reality, widespread today, is “pathological.”

Now “pathological” is a word belonging to that jargon of psychiatrists which is well named as “psychobabble,” because it dresses up in brand-new words, each of many syllables, what are merely good old miseries of fallen human nature. Now psychiatrists, themselves godless, cannot solve problems of godlessness, but at least they are trying, so to speak. So the novelty of psychobabble serves at least to suggest that the miseries being piled up in human beings today by the past centuries piling up the apostasy, do have something unprecedented about them. My friend writes:—

“Pathology may mean an occasional or congenital ailment, by extension an abnormal or distorted way of being, which, whether innate or acquired, has become part of an individual’s constitution. The same concept can be applied by extension to a group of individuals or a society. In this way one may speak of the pathological, i.e. sick, abnormal, condition of the modern world. As such, whether the condition is acquired or inborn, it is not seen for what it is by the person or persons concerned, nay, since they see it as normal they use it as a shield, and even boast about it. Abnormality becoming normal, and vice versa, is the drama of the modern world and modern man.”

Then we should find the priest neglecting the altar, women not giving birth and criminals not being hanged. But that is exactly the world around us – the

psychobabble fits! So here is what the same friend has to say about how Catholics must react to this pathological condition of the modern world:

“Catholics must understand that we are living in an unprecedented situation in which all sense of objective reality is steadily being lost. This means for the Church that points of reference still valid 50 years ago no longer apply. Different solutions are called for which not only take into account the possibility of ever increasing disorder, but also remain elastic enough to adapt to a continually worsening situation. If then doctrine is primary and decisive, Catholics and future priests must be taught doctrinally how unique these end-times are. The Gospels tell us of their coming in the future, but they are with us here now, and they are liable to get only worse, until such time as God says enough is enough.”

In brief, centuries of increasing apostasy have piled up in the human race a refusal of reality which can be called “pathological,” and which is causing unheard of levels of distress in people, distress unalleviated by an equally unprecedented level of material prosperity. The Catholic Church fought this apostasy, but when at Vatican II it gave up the fight, the pathological fantasy took over the world, and it lurched towards the Antichrist. Archbishop Lefebvre created a fortress of sanity inside the crumbling Church, but now the same pathology is well on its way to taking over his Society.

Teachers, teach! Doctors, heal! Women, give birth! Priests, study everything that Archbishop Lefebvre said and did. And Queen Isabella, please pray for us.

Kyrie eleison.

RESISTANCE VISION

No. CCCXIX (319)

August 24, 2013

A French Dominican who died in 1975 foresaw the Church crisis necessitating a loose network of pockets of resistant Catholics.

A number of Catholic souls today keeping the Catholic Faith are scared by the direction still being taken at present by the leadership of the Society of St Pius X, and since they appreciate just how much they have received from the Society over the last few decades, they desperately wish for a replacement Society to take its place. They are scared by the different vision of a network of independent pockets of resistance being their future. They may be reassured to know that it was the vision of an outstanding prophet and pioneer of the Traditional movement, the French Dominican priest Fr Roger-Thomas Calmel (1914–1975). Here are pages, freely translated and adapted from the French, of his Brief Apology for the Church of all Time (pp. 48–51):—

“However crazily the Catholic hierarchy may behave, priests cannot take the place of bishops, nor can laity take the place of priests. Do we then think of setting up a huge worldwide league or association of priests and Christian layfolk to enter into dialogue with the hierarchy and force them to restore Catholic order? It is a grand and touching idea, but it is unreal. That is because any such group, wanting to be a Church group but being neither a diocese nor an archdiocese nor a parish nor a religious order, will come under none of the categories over which and for which authority is exercised in the Church. It will be an artificial grouping, an artefact unknown to any of the Church’s real groups which are established and recognized as such.

“So, as with every grouping together of men, the problem of leadership and authority will arise, and the huger the group, the sharper the problem. Unfailingly it will come down to this: being an association, the group must solve the problem of authority; being artificial (no kind of natural or supernatural group), it cannot solve the problem of authority. Rival sub-groups will rapidly arise, war will become inevitable, and there will be no canonical way to end or wage such a war.

“Are we then condemned to being able to do nothing amidst the chaos, often a

sacrilegious chaos? I do not think so. Firstly, the indefectibility of the Church guarantees that down to the end of the world there will be enough of a genuine personal hierarchy to maintain the sacraments, in particular the Eucharist and Holy Orders, and to preach the one and only unchanging doctrine of Salvation. And secondly, whatever be the failings of the real hierarchy, we all of us, priests and laity, have our little part of authority.

“Therefore let the priest capable of preaching go to the limits of his power to preach, to absolve sins and to celebrate the true Mass. Let the teaching Sister go to the limits of her grace and her power to form girls in the Faith, good morals, purity and literature. Let every priest and layman, every little group of laity and priests having authority and power over a little fort of the Church and Christendom, go to the limits of their possibilities and powers. Let leaders and inmates of such forts know and be in contact with one another. Let each of the forts protected, defended, trained and directed in its praying and singing by a real authority, become as far as possible a fortress of holiness. That is what will guarantee the continuation of the true Church and will prepare efficaciously for its renewal in God’s good time.

“So we need not to be afraid, but to pray with all confidence and to exercise without fear, according to Tradition and in the sphere that is ours, the power we have, preparing thus for the happy time when Rome will come back to being Rome and bishops to being bishops.”

Kyrie eleison.

MILAN EDICT

No. CCCXX (320)

August 31, 2013

The Edict of Milan in 313 AD was decisive in making the Roman Empire Christian. State and Catholic Church do need to be united.

In our days when liberalism taking over the Society of St Pius X looks like merely the last in a long line of defeats of the Catholic Church, it is difficult to imagine that there was once a time when the Church scored one victory after another. Nevertheless this year we celebrate the 1700th anniversary of one of those victories, the Edict of Milan, dating from 313 AD.

The Roman Emperor Constantine, known as “Constantine the Great,” was born in 272 and he was baptised Christian only shortly before his death in 337, but he had been seriously sympathetic to Christianity for many years beforehand. When in 312 he marched on Rome to fight his rival, Emperor Maxentius, Our Lord promised him victory if he would put on his battle standards the “labarum,” the X with a P imposed on it, the first two Greek letters of the word Christ. Constantine did what Our Lord said, and defeated Maxentius at the battle of the Milvian Bridge. Once in firm control of Rome, Constantine issued the following year the Edict of Milan.

In the course of the previous 250 years, worshippers of Christ had suffered ten bloody persecutions under the Roman Emperors, from Nero (37–68) to Diocletian (243–316). Christians had refused the pagan State religion, so the State had banned Christianity. What the Edict of Milan did was to make Christianity for the first time legal alongside other religions allowed in the Empire. It was the decisive step in the conversion of Rome to Christianity. In 325 Constantine endorsed the orthodoxy of the dogmatic Council of Nicaea. In 380 the Emperor Theodosius made Christianity the official religion of Rome, and in 392 Theodosius forbade pagan worship.

Thus Constantine began that union of (Catholic) Church and State which was the foundation of Christendom, better known today as “Western civilisation.” Whatever may have been down the ages the abuse of that union in practice, it is in principle immensely fruitful for the salvation of souls. One need only think of how any township even today will profit from a sane priest and a sane policeman

complementing one another. For 1600 years the Catholic Church held to that principle of the union of Church and State, whereas for the last 200 years Revolutionary liberalism has constantly sought to undermine it. Only with Vatican II did the Church at last give way and repudiate the doctrine of the Catholic State by its teaching on religious liberty in *Dignitatis Humanae*. A ringleader of the neo-modernists at the Council, Fr Yves Congar rejoiced that the Council had put an end to the “Constantinian Church.”

Now it is true that the churchmen being linked to the worldly authorities will bring temptations of worldliness with it, but any State is bound to enforce laws that correspond to some religious or anti-religious view of God and man. To see how difficult it is to lead a Catholic life when that view of the State accords with the anti-religion of secular humanism, just look around you. It was the all-surrounding pressure of modern irreligious States upon the bishops of Vatican II that made them want to change the Catholic Church to fit the modern world. The same pressure is now making the leadership of the Society of St Pius X go the way of the Revolution.

Constantine on the contrary must down the ages have contributed to the salvation of millions of souls, an achievement for which he is surely in Heaven. Emperor Constantine, pray for us.

Kyrie eleison.

RESISTANCE, ORGANIZE?

No. CCCXXI (321)

September 7, 2013

When, as today, the Shepherd (Pope) is struck and the sheep are scattered, there are strict limits to how far the sheep can be organized.

The debate continues as to whether and how today's "Resistance" should be organized (let us here define "Resistance" as former members or followers of the Society of St Pius X so upset with its recently manifest change of direction as to take action of some kind to resist that change). Broadly speaking, the (relative) youngsters want an organisation to co-ordinate action and make it more effective, while the oldsters tend to think that any structured organisation is no longer possible or even desirable in today's chaotic circumstances.

To begin with, one must take the measure of the chaos. It comes essentially from the shepherd being struck and the sheep scattered (Zech. XIII, 7; Mt. XXVI, 31).

Whether it believes it or not, whether it likes it or not, for the whole world that shepherd is the Catholic Pope. As we observe today, if he goes crazy then nobody in the whole wide world can restore order. This is because the Incarnate God made his Church the salt of the earth and the light of the world (Mt. V, 13–14), and he designed that Church as a monarchy, a design which not even Vatican II could undo. Therefore nobody can take the Pope's place, and if he says things like, "Who am I to condemn a God-seeking homosexual?," as the present occupant of the See of Peter said recently, then "chaos is come again," and there is very little that one can do about it, besides praying for God to intervene.

Notwithstanding, Archbishop Lefebvre did all he could, and by the mercy of God he created an island of sanity and order, the SSPX. But, naturally, under pressure from one Conciliar Pope after another, his successors have given way. They ask, "How can we be Catholic and disobey the Pope?" – more confusion and chaos. However the Archbishop was so successful in organizing resistance to the Council that a number of those who understand what he was doing wish to organize the resistance to those betraying him. But can it be organized? That is the question.

A wise colleague, old enough to have campaigned hard and effectively at the

Archbishop's side in the worldwide expansion of the SSPX in the 1970's and 1980's, remembers from those early days a number of priests resisting the Council successfully all over the world, which they did independently of one another and of the Archbishop. They listened to him because he talked good Catholic sense, which is why many of them recognized his moral authority, but none of them obeyed him in the strict sense, and he demanded of none of them that obedience. Without the Pope, structured Catholic obedience was, and remains, impossible. My colleague goes on to point out that even the Archbishop's Society resisted liberal Church and world for only 30, maybe 40, years, and the situation is rather worse now than it was in his day. When the homeland is occupied by an enemy army, my colleague concludes, it is impossible to organize an army of defence, all that remains is guerrilla warfare.

In my opinion he accurately portrays the increase of the chaos when he writes: "The hour of God and of the immaculate Heart will come (as she has said) only when everything seems lost, which must include the little SSPX. Bishop Fellay's chief illusion was to have thought that the great SSPX would save the Church, to which the Devil added, "from within, like a Trojan horse." All that we in fact needed to do was construct Noah's Ark for the faithful remnant in accordance with the Founder's plan, and to go on constructing it until the Flood. A deluded leader opened the Ark's door ahead of time, and the Ark was flooded. God have mercy upon us all. The leader was not Noah, but the Captain of the Titanic."

Kyrie eleison.

CONCILIARIZING APACE

No. CCCXXII (322)

September 14, 2013

A closer look at the three SSPX bishops' Declaration of June 27 shows that it is not as strong as it might at first have seemed.

A good article arguing that the June 27 Declaration of three Society of St Pius X bishops is not as faithful to Catholic Tradition as it may seem to be, appeared in the August issue of England's new Catholic monthly magazine, *The Recusant*, self-described as "An unofficial SSPX newsletter fighting a guerrilla war for the soul of Tradition." A brief survey can hardly do justice to the article's seven dense pages, but the main line of thought deserves to be known. Here it is –

At first sight the June 27 Declaration seems to be Traditional, but, as with the documents of Vatican II A, there is usually a loophole, a fatal flaw, which allows the rest of the document to be undone. Let us take a closer look, paragraph by paragraph:—

#1 "Filial gratitude" is expressed towards Archbishop Lefebvre, but only harmless and soft-sounding quotes of his are included in the Declaration, with nothing from his 1988 Consecrations sermon, and none of his hard-hitting reasons for creating bishops to resist the "antichrists" in Rome. #3 It is admitted that the "cause" of the errors devastating the Catholic Church is in the Conciliar documents, but that is not to admit that the errors are there, since cause and effect cannot be identical. Yet most serious errors are themselves in the Council's texts, e.g. religious liberty. #4 It is recognized that Vatican II changed and vitiated the Church's manner of teaching, or teaching authority, but the main problem is not authority, but doctrine – see #8. #5 Only relatively soft language is used to evoke the Conciliar Church's "non-preoccupation" with the "reign of Christ." In fact the Conciliar Church denies and contradicts the full and true doctrine of the Social Kingship of Christ the King, battle-flag of the Archbishop and true Catholics today. #6 As in #3, it is admitted that the Council text's teaching on religious liberty leads to the dissolving of Christ, but the text is that dissolving, or putting of man in the place of God. Vatican II is the fruit not just of human weakness or absent-mindedness, but of a diabolical conspiracy. #7

Similarly ecumenism and interreligious dialogue are not just “silencing the truth about the one true Church,” they are denying and contradicting it. Nor are they just “killing the missionary spirit,” they are killing the missions, and with them millions of souls, all over the world. #8 On the other hand the ruin of the Church’s institutions is blamed on the destruction of authority within the Church by the Council’s collegiality and democratic spirit. But the essential problem (as the paragraph’s opening sentence does weakly say) is the loss of faith. Authority is secondary. #9 While pointing to real faults and serious omissions in the Novus Ordo rite of Mass, no mention is made of the worldwide carnage of souls wrought by its falsifying of their worship of God. The Novus Ordo Mass has been the main engine of the Church’s destruction from 1969 until today. #10 In conclusion, timid and deferential language is used to “ask with insistence” that Rome return to Tradition. But of course, in accordance with the SSPX’s “re-branding,” the Newsociety wants no more fighters or fighting talk. #11 The three bishops “mean . . .to follow Providence,” whether Rome returns to Tradition or not. What can that mean other than the eventual acceptance of a deal that will by-pass doctrine? #12 The Declaration concludes piously, with another dovelike quote from the Archbishop.

And The Recusant arrives at the sad but all too probable conclusion that the Declaration is only an apparent step backwards from the Declarations of April 15 and July 14 of last year, which were two clear steps forward in the conciliarizing of the SSPX. Heaven help it!

Kyrie eleison.

HORRIBLE FALL – III

No. CCCXXIII (323)

September 21, 2013

Insofar as the SSPX is a lifeboat being turned into a deathboat, souls must prepare to abandon it, and be ready not to attend its Masses.

Last June readers of these “Comments” were promised a third article on the horrible fall of the Society of St Pius X, to consider what can be done. Just recently there appeared on the website “Avec l’Immaculée” an article with some good answers to this question, starting with the question whether Catholics can go on attending SSPX Masses. I summarize and adapt:—

In 1984 an Indult from Rome allowed the Tridentine Mass to be celebrated, under certain conditions, within the framework of the official Church. Asked whether Catholics could attend these Masses, Archbishop Lefebvre replied soon after that they should not attend, because their re-entering the mainstream framework under those conditions was tantamount to accepting Vatican II and the subsequent reforms. The priests saying Indult Masses would not be able to speak freely, and by accepting implicitly the New Mass with the Indult, they would risk sliding into the new Conciliar religion and taking their people with them.

In 2012 Bishop Fellay declared that the New Mass was legitimately promulgated, which is tantamount to saying that it is legitimate. He stifles critics of Vatican II, and while still keeping priests and people as much in the dark as possible as to what he is really up to, he steadily pushes forward the ideas of his pro-Conciliar Declaration of April, 2012. Therefore just as the Archbishop ruled out attending Indult Masses, so now, as a general rule, attending SSPX Masses should be ruled out, because even if this particular Mass is still celebrated in accordance with Tradition, the SSPX is being remoulded in general as a framework within which the new Conciliar religion is less and less disapproved, so that there is more and more of a danger in attending its Masses.

However, particular SSPX priests vary from the genuinely Traditional to the virtually Conciliar. Obviously there is less danger in attending Masses of the former than of the latter, but if the priest concerned either defends and approves of the new direction

being imposed by SSPX HQ, or if he persecutes and excludes from the sacraments anybody taking any part in the Resistance, these are two signs that his Masses should be avoided, especially if there is the Mass of a resisting priest not too far away. But circumstances do also come into play, so that if, for instance, one's children risk being thrown out of a still decent SSPX school, that may justify still attending the local SSPX Mass. When the trunk of a tree is rotting, there can still be branches bearing green leaves.

The fact remains that the trunk of the SSPX is mortally stricken, without hope, humanly speaking, of recovery. Like the Synagogue between the death of Our Lord on the Cross and the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D, it is carrying death within it, but it is not yet dead. Apostles preached there, and good Jews still attended, but they were all persecuted and eventually thrown out. If a Catholic can see today that throughout the body of the SSPX, from the head downwards, the deadly virus of a disguised Conciliar mentality is coursing, he must take action to help rescue as many souls as possible before they make shipwreck in the faith with the sinking lifeboat.

Let him, to forge his own convictions, read all he can lay his hands on, starting with the exchange of letters between the three bishops and Bishop Fellay in April of 2012. Let him talk to priests and fellow-parishioners, to co-ordinate, for instance, the putting together of refuges for priests who might not otherwise take action. There is much to be done, however few there are, at least for the moment, to do it. God is with these few.

Kyrie eleison.

FATIMA SECRET

No. CCCXXIV (324)

September 28, 2013

Yet another reconstructed version of the third part of the Secret of Fatima has, by its origins, a good chance of being authentic.

Yet another reconstruction has come to light of the third part of the Secret of Fatima, revealed by the Mother of God to Sister Lucy in July, 1917. The Blessed Virgin wished it to be made public in 1960 at the latest, but the perfidious churchmen controlling Rome pretended that she had merely allowed it to be published from 1960 onwards, and it has been locked away ever since. From hints of its contents revealed by the few churchmen that have been able to read it, several attempts have been made to reconstruct it. This latest attempt has much in its favour. Here is its story.

Cardinal Ottaviani (1890–1979) was a high churchman under Popes Pius XII, John XXIII and Paul VI, main protector of the Faith from 1959 to 1968. Given to read the Secret, but bound by secrecy, he found a way to reveal it without revealing it. Adding material to make the original Secret two to three times as long, he allowed the elongated version to be published, notably in a German magazine called Neues Europa. But the Vatican authorities could easily dismiss it as a fake, as it is now regarded, because the original Secret was known to be only 25 hand-written lines.

However, the Cardinal had a friend, Don Luigi Villa (1918–2012), a valiant priest and defender of the true Church, especially against Freemasonry. At some point the Cardinal revealed to Fr. Villa exactly which parts of the longer version came from the original Secret, and Don Villa in turn told the same to his faithful lay collaborator, Dr. Franco Adessa, who has just put the same information into Chiesa Viva, an Italian periodical. Here then would be the original “Third Secret”:—

“A great chastisement will come down on the whole of mankind neither today, nor tomorrow, but in the second half of the 20th century. Nowhere in the world is there order, and Satan rules in the highest places, determining the course of events. He will even manage to work his way up to the top of the Church. For the Church too will come the time of its greatest trials. Cardinals will oppose cardinals, bishops will oppose bishops. Satan will march in their midst, and in Rome there will be changes.

What is rotten will fall, what falls will not get up again. The Church will be darkened and the world overwhelmed in terror. A great war will be let loose in the second half of the 20th century. Fire and smoke will fall from Heaven, the oceans' waters will be turned into steam, the foam of the sea will rise up, overwhelming and flooding everything. Millions and millions of men will die from one hour to the next, while those who survive will envy the dead. Death will be everywhere because of the errors committed by the madmen and henchmen of Satan, who then and only then will reign over the world. Finally while those who survive these events are still alive, they will proclaim once more God and the glory of God, and they will serve him as men used to do when the world had not yet become so perverse."

Fr Nicholas Gruner, an expert on Fatima, thinks that this version of the Secret may be incomplete, lacking mention of the Apocalypse and of recommended action. One may also object that the second half of the 20th century has come and gone with no World War. But have not madmen been stirring up war in the Middle East, continuously, from well before 2000 down to today? And it is worthy of note that every phrase in this version of the Secret does occur in the Neues Europaversion (accessible on the Internet), amidst material drawn or imitated from other pious sources.

In any case, may God truly have mercy upon us all, and let us pray the Rosary without ceasing.

Kyrie eleison.

FATAL MOMENT

No. CCCXXV (325)

October 5, 2013

Perhaps the SSPX's fate was sealed when at its General Chapter last July it put protecting the Superior General in front of seeking truth.

Most readers of these "Comments" have probably understood by now the grave problem that is paralysing the defence of the Faith by the Society of St Pius X, and they might rather read of other things. But such is the mess created in millions of people's minds by the global falling away from the Faith that I think one can hardly analyse too much today the nature of the Faith, the need of the Faith and how it gets undermined. Let me then, without wishing to harp on the SSPX's recent misfortunes or misdemeanours, borrow one more example from its history of last year.

The Society's General Chapter of July, 2012, was hailed immediately afterwards by many of its participants as a triumph of Society unity over the distress and tensions of the several previous months. Since that time however, a more sober view of the Chapter has taken over from the euphoria, and a number of those who took part in it see it rather as having been a disaster for the Society. One of the participants, or capitulants as they are called, has described the fatal moment when the Society's leading 39 priests (myself excluded) put their own Society and Superiors in front of the doctrine of the Faith, just as the mass of Catholic bishops had done at Vatican II.

The Chapter's deliberations proper opened with a serious doctrinal attack by the Rector of the SSPX seminary in Écône on the mid-April Doctrinal Declaration by which the SSPX had officially been ready to compromise with the neo-modernists in Rome on the Council, on the New Mass, on the New Code of Canon Law and on Pope Benedict's "hermeneutic of continuity." The attack was expressed in moderate and respectful terms, but it was most grave in substance. It meant in effect that whoever had drafted the Declaration, or encouraged its being submitted to Rome, was incompetent in Catholic doctrine. If they were consciously incompetent, they were traitors to the Faith. If unconsciously, they were unfit to be at the head of a Catholic Congregation founded to defend the Faith. So a hush fell upon the Chapter as capitulants began to realize how grave was the implicit accusation against their

Superiors.

But then the Rector of the Society's seminary in Argentina broke the hush by saying that the Chapter could not possibly administer a slap to its Superior General by requiring of him to retract his Declaration. That retraction, he said, would be implicit in the Chapter's final Declaration. Then some other capitulant raised a different point, and the Chapter slid on to other business. However, the doctrinal problem of the treacherous mid-April Declaration was properly resolved neither by the Chapter's final Declaration or six Conditions for a future agreement with Rome, nor by any clear subsequent retraction on the part of the Superior General himself, on the contrary. And the Society continues to be led in practice in accordance with the same policy of being gentle with the enemies of the Faith in Rome, who tear to pieces the Faith and with it the Church.

How could the capitulants not see that "respect for Superiors" was being put in front of the Faith? How could they not insist that the doctrinal problem, by far the most important problem in front of the whole Chapter, should be made clear, until all of them could fully grasp what action needed to be taken immediately, and not cleverly postponed until the end of the Chapter? The answer must be that collectively they were, like the bishops of Vatican II, children of the modern world for whom the doctrine of the Faith is not a vital necessity, but just something one learns in the seminary to become a priest, and then honours, but more or less disregards. Readers, read!

Kyrie eleison.

HAPPY ANNIVERSARY

No. CCCXXVI (326)

October 12, 2013

A house is being bought in South-east England to serve as a base of operations for the “Resistance.” Details of how to help are given.

I have good news for all Catholics who understood what Archbishop Lefebvre was about. An eight-bedroom house is being bought in south-east England to serve as a base of operations for anybody wishing to continue his work outside of the present SSPX. For a whole year since my “exclusion” from the SSPX I have lain low, at least physically speaking, to watch and wait to see how things would develop within the SSPX, but they are not getting any better, alas.

And so just as the Archbishop can only have wished that Conciliar Rome would come back to its Catholic senses so that there would be no further need for his Society to maintain Tradition, so too one might now wish that the present SSPX leaders would come back to the Archbishop’s way of thinking about Conciliar Rome, so that resistance to their virtual conciliarism would be unnecessary. But wishes do not make reality go away, and that reality is that just as Conciliar Rome is obdurate in its apostasy, so too the SSPX leaders have not stopped promoting their own authority to do what they like with the Archbishop’s legacy – authority over truth. That is why some bricks and mortar have become a necessity for the on-going service of the true Church.

The house is being bought in England because England is the only country that I cannot be thrown out of as a foreigner. It is in south-east England with a relatively gentle climate for England, in a town not too far by fast train from London, and of easy access by Eurostar from Paris and Brussels. It is a picturesque town, and should be an agreeable place for priests to visit, to wind down, to talk (in all discretion), and to wind up again for today’s difficult apostolate. But it will cost more or less £400,000 to buy, and it will cost rather more to run than my present frugal way of life, for which I have not been in need and have hardly appealed. Let people who are themselves in need not think of contributing (see II Cor.VIII, 12–13), but let investors with fragile investments think of transferring funds to their completely secure bank accounts in

Heaven before the stock markets collapse and before today's paper monies are inflated out of all recognition. I must find within two months or so a tenth of the sum, and the rest soon afterwards.

* In ANY CURRENCY small credit- or debit-card contributions from anywhere in the world can easily reach us via PayPal. (Go to www.paypal.com/sendmoney and send the contribution to buildingfund@stmarcelinitiative.com)

* Contributions in POUNDS STERLING by banker's draft or check should be made out and sent to the St Marcel Initiative, P.O. Box 423, Deal CT 14 4BF, England.

* Banker's drafts or checks in US DOLLARS should likewise be made out to St Marcel Initiative and sent to 6051 Watson Rd., Suite 279, Crestwood, MO 63126, USA (the US contributions will soon be tax-deductible).

* In EUROS, checks made out to "Institut Culturel St Benoît" should be posted to ICSB, BP 60232, F78002 Versailles Cedex, France. Euros can also be sent by wire transfer from inside France to RIB – [write to letters@eleisoncomments.com for the number]; from outside France to the International Bank Account Number IBAN – [write to letters@eleisoncomments.com for the number]. For other bank wire transfers, please write to us for details at letters@eleisoncomments.com, or, in the USA, use the convenient "e-check/bank wire" form at www.stmarcelinitiative.com.

Any contribution please mark "Building Fund." Thank you in advance for all and any help.

Kyrie eleison.

FRANCIS GODLESS

No. CCCXXVII (327)

October 19, 2013

Nine key quotes from an interview of the new Pope show that he is not rescuing drowning modern man, but drowning with him.

Catholics who retain any real sense of their faith are being scandalized by the words and deeds of the man presently seated on the Chair of Peter. One almost wonders if he was put there to destroy what remains of the Catholic Church. Like a true child of Vatican II, he is turning away from God towards man. Here for example are the first nine of eleven key quotes extracted (not by me) from an interview given by Francis on September 24 to the atheist editor of an Italian newspaper.

Quotes 2 to 5 concern the Church (I summarize): 2 The Church administration must be more horizontal, less vertical. 3 The Roman Curia is too self-serving. It must go out to the people. 4 The Pope must no longer be a king surrounded by flattering courtiers. 5 Too many priests are self-serving, and obstacles to Christianity. Now quotes like these will obviously please a modern democratic public that has never liked being told by the official Church what to do, but are these quotes fair or just towards the countless Popes, Curias, Administrations and Priests that went before Francis for 1900 years to maintain the structure of the Church for the salvation of souls? Will Francis on the contrary leave any structure still standing, any souls saved, behind him?

Quotes 1 and 6 concern the world: 1 On my watch the Church will stay out of politics. To leave democratic men to throw themselves into Hell? 6 The world's two worst problems today are the unemployment of the young and the loneliness of the old. Now these are two real human problems of today, but why? Is it not because churchmen like Francis leave, precisely, politics to the politicians, putting money in front of young people? And because churchmen like him refuse to enforce those Church laws which, by holding the family together, help it to look after old people?

Quotes 7 to 9 concern religion: 9 Jesus gave us only one way of salvation, love of one another. But love of neighbour without love of God coming first turns into hatred of neighbour, for example Communism. 7a Converting people makes no sense. It makes the greatest of sense, if, as is the case, nobody can get to Heaven without believing in

God and in his Divine Son, Jesus Christ! 7b We must all mix together and move one another to the Good. But we must all move one another towards God. What else is the Good? If Francis will not mention God, who will believe in God?

Quote 8 is the gravest of all: 8a “I believe in God, not in a Catholic God, there is no Catholic God.” This is gravely misleading. True, God is the God of all men, but he instituted for all men one religion, and one religion only, and that is the Catholic religion. Thus the God of Catholicism is the one and only true God. 8b “Jesus is his incarnation, my teacher and my pastor, but God the Father, Abba, is the light and the Creator.” Also gravely misleading. Does not that “but” suggest that Jesus is not the Creator? Does Francis believe that Jesus is anything more than just a man? 8c “Everyone has his own idea of good and evil and must choose to follow the good and fight evil as he conceives them.” This is not misleading at all. This is the denial of all objective morality, the denial of all principles of Catholic morality. This is an invitation to all men to do as they like. Coming from the man who is to all appearances the Catholic Pope, it is sheer insanity.

Pope Francis may plead that he is trying to get through to modern man, but to get through to him without God is just like jumping into a dangerous river to help a drowning man without a rope tied to the bank. One will only drown with him. Your Holiness, you are not helping but drowning!

Kyrie eleison.

N.B. Error in the American address last week – not 6051 Watson Street, but 9051. Apologies.

FALLING SSPX

No. CCCXXVIII (328)

October 26, 2013

One reader attributes the SSPX's fall to unrealistic dreaming. Another reader thinks that the problem has been an undervaluing of the laity.

For the glory of God and for the salvation of souls it is essential to diagnose why in today's circumstances an end is now threatening the 40 glorious years of the defence of the Faith by the Society of St Pius X. An article and a letter recently written may help in this respect: an article analyzing the Society's fall, and a letter with a note of hope as to how it may rise again.

The article appeared in French on the Internet (see "Un Évêque se lève"). After reading a book on utopianism in modern education which compares it to the same unrealistic dreaming in modern politics, the article's author found that the same pattern in six stages could be applied to the SSPX. Firstly, the pattern: 1 A refusal of human nature as a given to be worked with, and not against. 2 A dream of fabricating the child/man completely anew. 3 The exclusion of natural structures of family/society. 4 The total re-fashioning of the child to generate a perfect new society. 5 The disastrous results, despite all the initial good intentions – 6 Ignorant and perverse children, and a society apostatising and making war on God.

Secondly, the application to the SSPX: 1 Refusal of the reality of the unprecedented crisis in the Church. 2 Dream of fabricating a reconciliation between the Conciliar Church and Tradition. 3 Exclusion of natural interaction between leaders and led. 4 Total re-fashioning of Catholic authority to impose the dream. 5 Disastrous resulting Stalinization of the SSPX, despite all pious intentions – in education, politics or the SSPX, when the dreamer confronts unyielding reality, he is liable to use all the force he has at his disposal to crush the reality – his dream is so much more lovely. 6 Loss of fighting spirit, liable to lead to entire loss of Faith.

The letter, reaching me by e-mail, follows the same general line of analysis, but adds a note of hope. Pope Francis and Bishop Fellay being who they are (both utopians, one might add), the letter-writer thinks that a Rome-SSPX agreement is bound to come, and resistance to it will be crushed. If the SSPX thus falls, he thinks it will have been

by its under-estimating of the laity and by its under-employing of them to help establish in society the Social Reign of Christ the King. The SSPX need only pick up again with the laity to work for that Reign, and – here is the hopeful note – it will rally and strengthen all kinds of Catholics who have kept the Faith despite all they have suffered in recent years, coming from the Novus Ordo, from Ecclesia Dei, from Franciscans of the Immaculate, or wherever. Thus, concludes the letter-writer, “the SSPX by the action of those remaining faithful to it will not sink into chaos, quite the opposite.”

For myself, while I agree that clericalism (undervaluing the laity) has been one aspect of the problem of the SSPX, I do not think that it has been the root of the problem. I think that the root has rather been today’s universal turning to man instead of God (cf. Jer. XVII, 5,7), a falling away by no means confined to the SSPX, with the consequent loss of objective truth and falsehood, objective right and wrong. However, I do agree with the letter-writer’s vision of a new alliance being forged at some time in the future, of true Catholics from all corners of the Newchurch and the Church, to carry forward the Catholic Faith (cf. Mt. XIX, 30). May the SSPX shake off its present problems to play a leading part, or, better, a humble part, in that alliance.

Kyrie eleison.

PLEASE HELP

No. CCCXXIX (329)

November 2, 2013

The usefulness of a house to serve as a base of operations for the “Resistance” is given, with practical details of how to help buy it.

Regularly over the last 20 years I have said that the Society of St Pius X could fail. Colleagues never liked me saying it, and contrary to what some people think, I did not enjoy saying it either, but here we are. Here for instance is a quotation sent to me recently by a reader, taken from an ordinations sermon I gave in 1984, and which of course I had completely forgotten:—

“At the beginning of the Church Militant Jesus Christ led his followers through the catacombs and persecution out into the open, and at the end of the Church Militant He may well lead them from the tent in the open field through persecution back to the catacombs. If it comes to that, and if we make it to the catacombs, for many of us it will certainly not have been without the Society but back in the catacombs we may have to do without the Society (. . .). Dear seminarians! Regularly I tell them (. . .) that the whole world is against them; that the whole world is going to hell in a hand-basket; that the Society of St. Pius X could easily perish; that the future is dark and where there is no gloom it is full of doom. Do you know, I do believe that if any of my dire forebodings actually came true, seminarians would be pleasantly surprised!” And what do I think I see now in the “Resistance”? The painful but steady emergence of the joyful remnant of Catholics from the remnant of Traditionalists who in their time emerged from the ruins of Vatican II. Nothing yet persuades me of the need for a structure or a seminary to replace those of the SSPX, but these are early days in the history of the Resistance. What I do think is needed is a base of Resistance operations in England, not far from the Continent nor from London airports, bricks and mortar to lend some solidity to the Resistance, and to provide, for instance, a refuge where priests can recuperate for at least a few days, under no kind of pressure, from the real hardships of today’s apostolate.”

The house has been chosen, it does exist, we have agreed to buy, and donations are coming in, but we do now need both £40,000 by the end of November and another

£360,000 by mid-December. I do not like making promises, but with the help of God I have no intention of abandoning the defence of the Faith, whatever form that defence may take over the next several years. Please help, and in today's shadow of tomorrow's collapse of currencies, do think of making a heavenly investment guaranteed by the whole host of Heaven. Bless you for any and all donations. I attach again details of means of payment.

Kyrie eleison.

* In ANY CURRENCY small credit- or debit-card contributions from anywhere in the world can easily reach us via PayPal. (Go to www.paypal.com/sendmoney and send the contribution to buildingfund@stmarcelinitiative.com).

* Contributions in POUNDS STERLING by banker's draft or check should be made out and sent to the St Marcel Initiative, P.O. Box 423, Deal CT 14 4BF, England.

* Banker's drafts or checks in US DOLLARS should likewise be made out to St Marcel Initiative and sent to 9051 Watson Rd., Suite 279, Crestwood, MO 63126, USA (the US contributions will soon be tax-deductible).

* In EUROS, checks made out to "Institut Culturel St Benoît" should be posted to ICSB, BP 60232, F78002 Versailles Cedex, France. Euros can also be sent by wire transfer from inside France to RIB – [write to letters@eleisoncomments.com for the number]; from outside France to the International Bank Account Number IBAN – [write to letters@eleisoncomments.com for the number].

* For other bank wire transfers, please write to us for details at buildingfund@dinoscopus.org, or, in the USA, use the convenient "e-check/bank wire" form at www.stmarcelinitiative.com.

FATIMA CONTESTED

No. CCCXXX (330)

November 9, 2013

Four objections to the second and (supposed) third parts of the Secret of Fatima are answered. The Chastisement they evoke is yet to come.

At the outset of the 20th century surely God gave to the modern world two great lights: for theory, through Pius X, the Encyclical *Pascendi* in 1907, to denounce the key error of subjectivism; for practice, through his Mother, the apparitions of Fatima in 1917, to provide a remedy for the monstrous plague of Communism. But the Devil deflects attention from *Pascendi*, and raises a series of objections to discredit Fatima. Here are a few of the main objections:—

* How can we take seriously Cardinal Ottaviani's version of the third part of the Fatima Secret when supposedly Our Lady says there that a third World war will start in the latter part of the 20th century? The year 2000 has come and gone, and there has been no third World War. There is an interesting parallel here between the second and third parts of the Secret of Fatima. In the second part Our Lady said that a worse war than WW I would start under the reign of the next Pope, which was Pius XI. Yet Pius XI died in the spring of 1939 and WW II was only declared in the autumn when Pius XII was Pope. Did Our Lady get her calendar wrong? No, she was simply going by the reality instead of by the appearances. In reality WW II started in 1938 when Stalin was deciding to make a pact with Hitler so as to liberate Hitler to make war on his western front. See in the May, 2000, Rector's Letter (on eleisonkommentar.blogspot.com) the whole fascinating story of this real start to WW II. Now whether or not the Ottaviani version is or is not the true "Third Secret," may the reality not be that WW III began in the Middle East before the year 2000, for instance with the first invasion of Iraq in 1991? Things are not always how they appear.

* In WW II we saw horrific bombings of Dresden, Tokyo, Nagasaki. What will be new here? Total WW II deaths are reckoned usually at some 66 million, in the tens of millions. If one reads rightly several warnings of Our Lady, and not only in Fatima, casualties from WW III and the Chastisement will be reckoned in the thousands of

millions. Of the order of 100 times worse.

* But what material Chastisement could be worse than the spiritual chastisement of our own days? True, next after the Fall of Adam and Eve, Vatican II was the worst disaster in all the history of mankind. Yet the mass of men see it as a great liberation. “Sticks and stones will break my bones, but words will never hurt me,” is the old saying. Spiritual punishments are in themselves much greater, but it takes material things for us men to understand (cf. Mt. IX, 6, and Jn. XX, 27).

* Our Lady of Fatima promised a period of peace if the Pope performed a certain consecration. Popes since then have performed several such consecrations, but we have had no peace. True, there have been several consecrations inspired no doubt by Our Lady of Fatima, but never yet exactly as she required: by the Pope, of Russia, to her Immaculate Heart, in union with all the bishops of the world. One or other of these four conditions has always been lacking.

* Our Lady of Fatima told us of “nations being annihilated” and of “a period of peace.” We saw nations annihilated in WW II, and a period of peace in the 1950’s. Her prophecies have happened. What nations have remained annihilated since WW II, and just how much peace was there in the Cold War of the 1950’s? Our Lady of Fatima spoke of far greater events than have yet happened.

Sacred Heart of Jesus, have mercy upon us. Immaculate Heart of Mary, intercede for us.

Kyrie eleison.

TOMORROW'S LEADERS

No. CCCXXXI (331)

November 16, 2013

America's Dr Paul Craig Roberts denounces the foolishness behind the collapse of the USA economy being wrought by the New World Order.

There are two good reasons why not even very pious Catholics should scorn economic questions. Individually, to run their own household they need common sense in this domain, now heavily discounted. And socially, they need some grasp of what is going on in the society around them, because that truth is heavily distorted by the conscious or unconscious agents of the anti-Christian New World Order (NWO), which aims to make all souls finish in Hell.

More than once readers here have had recommended to them the common sense and truthfulness of an American commentator, Dr Paul Craig Roberts. He has recently written an article arguing that the real crisis in the USA government is not its shutdown, being then much talked about, but its constant underlying inability to balance its budget, because of too little income and too much expenditure. The too little income he attributes not to the expense of Social Security, which pays its way, but to decades of out-shoring America's manufacturing to foreign lands with cheap labour, which has so impoverished American consumers that tax revenues have severely dropped. Too much expenditure he attributes to the draining cost of one foreign war after another. So he diagnoses that for the American government to solve its real crisis, the jobs must be brought home and the foreign wars stopped. But "powerful organized interests oppose any such measures, and so Congress will do neither."

In fact Dr Roberts adds that in his opinion the American economy cannot be salvaged in its present form because unwise use of technology is exhausting the environment. Moreover economists being "incapable of original thought" and "elected representatives being dependent on the private interests that finance their election campaigns," then "at this time collapse seems the most likely forecast." And there will only come something more intelligent from the ruins, he says, if there will be leaders to show the way.

The Doctor paints a dark picture, but its common sense and truth must be heeded. The common sense is that a major budget problem must be solved by a major increase in revenue or by a major cut in costs, or both. It cannot be solved by going into ever more colossal debt. One truth he mentions is the foolishness of economists without common sense, for example their pretence that manufacturing jobs, being outmoded, might just as well be out-sourced. Another truth is the power of the “organized interests” that push for foreign wars, and of the “private interests” that control the supposedly democratic elections.

But what motive can these interests have for wishing to drive the United States economy into collapse? Agents of the NWO are working hard to break down the United States and all Western nations with any national identity or pride, so that they will let themselves be the more easily absorbed into the NWO. Economists will be made dumb in the Schools of Economics, and elected representatives will be handsomely paid to enmesh their countries in debt, because Scripture says that the debtor makes himself servant, or slave, of the creditor. Thus the problem of Western governments is being made deliberately so insoluble that the temptation to distract the enslaved peoples with World War III will eventually become irresistible. Was it not resisted only just in the recent push for the attack on Syria? Catholics, you are going to have to be tomorrow those leaders that Dr Roberts hopes for today. Only you have the complete picture. Study and pray.

Kyrie eleison.

FAITH FIRST

No. CCCXXXII (332)

November 23, 2013

Taking drastic measures to resist Vatican II or the sell-out of the SSPX is only justified in either case by the betrayal of Catholic doctrine.

The great lesson taught by Archbishop Lefebvre (1905–1991) to Catholics who had ears to hear was that the Faith is higher than obedience. The sad lesson we have learned since is that obedience keeps on being rated higher than the Faith. These “Comments,” driven continually by today’s confusion in Church, world and Society of St Pius X to get back to basics, have often attempted to explain why the Faith must come first.

Take for instance the arguments of an honourable SSPX priest who recently sent me an e-mail, accusing me of wrongly assessing the present state of the SSPX. My resistance to the – as I call it – Newsociety is, he says, 1) too personally motivated, 2) forgetting the good of the Church, 3) inconsistent with positions I have taken before, 4) lacking Catholic realism, 5) against Church indefectibility, 6) for each man being his own Pope, 7) for a modernist vision of the Church, 8) Protestant, 9) against union with Rome, and finally 10) pushing souls away from the Church.

Now, I am no Archbishop Lefebvre, and I do not pretend to be, but does my colleague realize that all of these arguments (except the third) he could have applied thirty years ago to the Archbishop’s resistance to the official Church authorities in Rome? Yet the Archbishop’s resistance was 1) motivated only by the urgent need to defend the Faith, 2) for the good of the Universal Church, 4) in a completely realistic way (as the Catholic fruits of his Society proved), 5) not disproving but proving, by his very resistance, the Church’s indefectibility, 6) for the Church of all time being the measure of the Popes, 7) against all craziness of neo-modernism, 8) against modernism’s renewal of Protestantism, 9) for union with the Catholic Rome of all time, and finally 10) helping many truly Catholic souls to keep the Faith instead of losing it.

And what justified the Archbishop’s resistance back then? What proved then that he was not, despite the appearances, a rebel like Luther, but truly Catholic, and a great

servant of the Church? His doctrine, his doctrine, his doctrine! Whereas Luther denied a mass of Catholic teachings, the Archbishop affirmed every one of them. It was in the name of the doctrine of the Faith that the Archbishop took his stand against the Conciliar Popes and Church authorities who were radically undermining that doctrine by renewing and adopting the dreadful errors of modernism.

So what justifies now a certain resistance to the leadership of the SSPX? How can those who resist claim to be the truest servants of the SSPX? Doctrine, doctrine, doctrine! The mid-April Declaration of 2012 was proof of an appalling doctrinal deficiency at the top of the SSPX, and while the Declaration was withdrawn, its contents have not been retracted but even defended, as being for instance “too subtle”! Nor have the official SSPX documents of July 14, 2012 or June 27, 2013 properly undone the damage. The proof is that the governing policy of SSPX HQ has not changed. Dear colleague, your own Society was founded on putting Faith before apparent obedience, and now you want to defend that Society by putting apparent obedience to the Society before the Faith? Study the documents, and watch the actions!

Kyrie eleison.P.S. Meanwhile does anybody have a complete set of Spanish or French translations of this “Commentary” from when they began to appear, in the early EC 100’s? Please let us know.

FATHER RIOULT – I

No. CCCXXXIII (333)

November 30, 2013

Six reasons are given by the trail-blazer of the “Resistance” in France for the lack of reaction within the SSPX to its betrayal in 2012.

Why was there not an uprising amongst priests of the Society of St Pius X when their leaders’ loss of grip on Catholic doctrine and subsequent betrayal of Archbishop Lefebvre’s work became absolutely clear from March of last year onwards? Fr. Olivier Rioult, trail-blazer of the “Resistance” in France, gave several good reasons last month in an interview accessible in French on pelagiusasturiensis.wordpress.com. The following summary is freely adapted from the original text:—

Basically, original sin: Once the original fight for Tradition in the 1970’s and ‘80’s had succeeded in guaranteeing the survival of the essentials of the Faith, Traditionalists sat back on their laurels to enjoy their cosy enclaves, and they settled into a comfortable routine which they are now reluctant to lose. They have lost the spirit of fighting for the Faith.

Secondly, that particular form of original sin which is liberalism: Over the last ten years Society leaders have given the lead in weakening the fight against liberalism, error and immodesty. But to cease swimming against the current is to drift backwards, and a number of SSPX priests – by no means all – have grown weaker in their convictions and their preaching.

Thirdly, activism: some colleagues can also let themselves be run off their feet by their priestly tasks, leaving themselves no time or inclination to read or study. Turning into mere administrators and communicators, they weaken their convictions and preaching.

Fourthly, Bishop Fellay’s trickery: for years his double-talk deceived everybody except a small minority of clear-sighted souls who could absolutely not get a hearing. Only last year did his mask come off with the March “Cor Unum” and with his reply of April 14 to the three bishops. The great majority of Traditionalists he had put to sleep (as he is now doing again).

Fifthly, fear of the unknown: when the whole world around you is going mad, and you find an enclave of sanity, and then that enclave also begins to go mad, it requires unusual strength of character to face up to the reality and not prefer some illusion or other, and of illusions there are plenty! Thus many priests realize that they are living through a drama calling for some crucifying decisions, but they lack the necessary fortitude to launch into the unknown.

And last but not least, bad leaders: of course there have always been liberals within the SSPX as within the mainstream Church, but for as long as the leaders hold firm, these can be held in check. However, when in the mainstream Church John XXIII and Paul VI favoured their liberalism, the result was a tidal wave, and now that SSPX leaders have turned liberal, liberalism is sweeping through the Society as it would never have done under good leaders, true leaders.

These reasons given by Fr Rioult are all true, but none of them are stronger than that Faith which is “our victory over the world” (I Jn.V, 4). Indeed one might say that all the reasons come down to the lack of a strong enough Faith on the part of the priests, because they are living in a world in which the grip on Truth of every soul alive has been loosened, and if Truth is not true, how can Faith be true?

Then what is the simplest way to strengthen one’s grip on Truth, as we absolutely need to do in today’s crazy circumstances? In my opinion:—

“Watch and pray, watch and pray,

Fifteen Mysteries every day.”

Kyrie eleison.

TRANSATLANTIC RESISTANCE

No. CCCXXXIV (334)

December 7, 2013

A journey through Canada, the USA and Mexico suggests that the “Resistance,” while yet weak in numbers, is strong in the Faith.

From a late autumn journey I made through centres of Catholic Resistance in Canada, the United States and Mexico, it seems as though the Resistance may be weak in numbers but it is strong in the Faith, which means that it certainly has a future. Once more the story of a faithful remnant is being repeated. With God it is quality and not quantity that counts.

Québec, once the most Catholic province of Canada, was devastated by Vatican II, but after the Council the Society of St Pius X built up important Traditional centres in Montreal and in Lévis, near the city of Québec. In Lévis now the Traditionalists are being divided, as souls strong in the Faith pick up on the Society’s dangerous change of course towards the Newchurch. The split amongst Traditionalists is a great shame, but the Faith must come first, as souls can see that are being given the grace to join the Resistance. It has the future that the Newchurch has not.

A major interest for the future of the Resistance in the USA is Fr Joseph Pfeiffer’s seminary initiative in Kentucky, which had six seminarians when I passed through in early November. I admire the fact that Fr Pfeiffer is envisaging a different kind of priestly formation for today’s insane circumstances. Since internment camps have been prepared all over the USA for any “rebels” who will seriously oppose the New World Order, it makes sense to me to be thinking of making future priests learn by heart a catechism and a Bible history, as written for children! For have the Society’s classical seminaries produced many priests strong enough in the Faith to see the need for Resistance? As after Vatican II, how many “good” priests are just following along.

In Texas I addressed a meeting of right-wing patriots who have for many years rallied around the Spotlightnewspaper, now the American Free Press, to defend their country from anti-patriots. By no means all of them are Catholics, but they do grasp that there is a serious problem in their nation’s politics. In any case they listened attentively to the argument that politics are merely a spill-over from religion, or from its lack, and

that the only solution is a return to Catholicism.

In northern Mexico a former SSPX priest from Chile, Fr René Trincado, is building up thriving Resistance chapels which I visited in Chihuahua and Saltillo, and it looks as though another major Resistance centre will soon emerge in Guadalajara, a major city which was at the centre of the famous Catholic uprising of the Cristeros in the 1920's. In fact the Resistance is an unorganised and spontaneous uprising of Traditional Catholics all over the world. Their sense of the Faith is reacting instinctively to the change of direction towards the mainstream Church being imposed from the top of the Society. Unity in a return to that Newchurch is unity in suicide of the Faith.

My last stop was Mexico City, scene of Hernan Cortes' famous military conquest of Mexico in 1521. Even more deserving of fame is Our Lady's miraculous spiritual conquest of the land by her apparitions in Guadalupe ten years later, creating a brand-new Catholic country. To this day her shrine attracts millions of pilgrims, and it is the same instinct of the Faith that is enabling another former SSPX priest, Fr Hugo Ruiz, to begin building up what will surely become an important Resistance centre in his nation's capital city.

In brief, the world may be plunging into chaos and the mainstream SSPX may be giving up on the effort to resist that plunge, but a remnant of souls are realizing what is happening, and they are taking action to preserve the Faith. It may have to go into hiding, but it will not die.

Kyrie eleison.

FATHER RIOULT – II

No. CCCXXXV (335)

December 14, 2013

Fr Rioult, like Fr Calmel, sees the future of the Resistance in terms rather of a network of forts than of a worldwide organization.

Let me quote Fr Olivier Rioult from his October 6 interview in Paris (cf. EC 333) on another question, much disputed within today's Catholic Resistance – the question of organization. Fr Rioult was asked whether he thought it was possible to set up a new worldwide organization, or would he rather opt for some kind of free association such as has grouped together sedevacantists for a number of years? Here is his answer, this time in his very own words:—

“In the months to come I may be setting up a broad kind of association based on friendship with other Catholics in the Resistance, whether or not they are sedevacantists, sedevacantism being for me an opinion. But the situation is not ripe here and now for such an association. In any case whatever is Catholic is ours. So any Catholics ready to operate as Catholics and to resist the modernism reigning supreme within the Church, we will work with. Therefore yes, to a broad kind of association sharing the same common good: the Faith and worship of the Catholic Church, the defence of the Faith. Having this same common good can create friendship amongst all our groups.

“I think that the closer we come to the end times, the more Catholics will have to be anarchists, not in principle but in practice. By which I mean, they will have to be against all the powers that be, because these will all have been neutralized, undermined or subverted, operating contrary to the natural order. Hence, in practice, Catholics will have to stand up to them all, in Church or State . . . because they will all be twisted out of shape, under Masonic influence . . . serving in any case the Prince of this world. So I think it will be very difficult to create any more worldwide structures. The French Dominican priest, Fr Roger Calmel, had a clear view of things. As far back as 1970 he said that the natural leaders in any given place will have to make their ministry shine out in that one place, being tied by bonds of no more than friendship to the leaders in any other place.

“In 1970, in the French periodical “Itinéraires” (#149), he wrote: “The fight for the Faith will have to be fought by little groups refusing to enter into any structured or universal organizations. Within these various groups, such as a small school, a humble convent, a prayer group, a gathering of Christian families or the organizing of a pilgrimage, the authority is real and accepted by everybody . . . All that is needed is for each Catholic to reach as far as his grace and authority will carry him in the little sphere which is certainly his to lead, and which he will take charge of without having over him any grand administrative structures to make him do so’.”

If Fr. Calmel wrote that in 1970 for the circumstances of 1970, one might say either that he was seeing too far ahead, or that Archbishop Lefebvre proved by organizing the Society of St Pius X what could still be done in 1970. But I do think that Fr. Calmel was right in the long run. One might say, watching what happened to the Society last year, that it was bound to run into the sand. Archbishop Lefebvre, like Pope St Pius X, conducted a marvelous rearguard action, but one notes how much less the Archbishop could achieve, coming 70 years later than the Pope, and now we are 40 years on from the Archbishop. In a world marching to its ruin the realization of Fr. Calmel’s prophecy could not be indefinitely delayed.

Dear readers, if we wish to stay with Our Lord, we have no choice but to gird our loins. In my opinion, Fr Calmel and Fr Rioult are right. Mother of God, Help of Christians, help!

Kyrie eleison.

BILLOT – I

No. CCCXXXVI (336)

December 21, 2013

The Venerable Bartholomew Holzhauser's division of Church history into Seven Ages was taken up by a famous French theologian.

For years I have been giving a conference on the Seven Ages of the Church, based on the Venerable Bartholomew Holzhauser's Commentary on the book of the Apocalypse. Holzhauser, a German priest of the first half of the 1600's, said that he wrote it under inspiration. The conference has been popular, especially because it fits the craziness of our age into a harmonious pattern of the history of the Church. What I had not realized, however, is that Holzhauser's vision is shared by a famous classical theologian, making it more difficult to dismiss Holzhauser as a mere visionary or "apparitionist."

It is in an Epilogue to the first volume of his classic Treatise on the Church of Christ that Cardinal Louis Billot (1846–1931) lays out in some detail the correspondence affirmed by Holzhauser between seven main periods of Church history and the seven Letters to the seven churches of Asia that make up Chapters II and III of the book of the Apocalypse. Billot's Epilogue never mentions Holzhauser, but it is difficult to imagine that there is no connection. However, Billot takes care to start out the correspondence not from any vision or inspiration, but from the Greek names of the seven churches. The suitability of these names to the Church's evolving history is either a remarkable coincidence, or more likely a trace of Providence at work – God, the Master of History!

Thus Billot says that Ephesus (Apoc. II, 1–7) signifies in Greek a "starting out," obviously suitable to the Apostolic Age (33–70 AD) with which the Church began. Smyrna (Apoc. II, 8–11) names the second church and means "myrrh," corresponding to the passion and sufferings of the Church's Second Age (70–313 AD), that of the Martyrs. Pergamus (Apoc. II, 12–17) was a city famous for literature, so that "pergamum" came to mean material on which to write, corresponding to the cluster of great Church writers belonging to the Church's Third Age, that of the Doctors (313–800). Thyatira names the next church (Apoc. II, 18–29), and means "splendour

of triumph,” corresponding to the 1,000-year triumph of the Catholic Church, reaching from Charlemagne (742–814) to the French Revolution (1789).

These thousand years might also be reckoned from around the conversion of Clovis (496) to the outbreak of Protestantism (1517). But whether one marks the decline of Christendom from the Reformation or the Revolution, in any case Sardis, naming the fifth church (Apoc. III, 1–6), was the city of Croesus, a fabulously rich man, evoking an abundance of money, material prosperity and spiritual decadence, such as characterize modern times. Indeed the warnings to the church of Sardis correspond perfectly to our own age today, as we shall see with Billot in further “Comments.”

We move clearly into the future with the sixth church, that of Philadelphia (Apoc. III, 7–13), meaning “love” (Phil-) of “brotherhood” (- adelphia). Cardinal Billot has this name correspond to a last great triumph of the Church, marked notably by the conversion of the Jews as prophesied by St Paul (Rom. XI, 12), and by their reconciliation with the Gentiles, brothers at last in Christ (Eph. II, 14–16).

But the church of Philadelphia is warned that tribulation is coming (Apoc. III, 10), which corresponds to the seventh and last Age of the Church, that of Laodicea (Apoc. III, 14–22), named from judgment (dike) of the peoples (laon). It will be the Age of the last and most terrible trial of the Church, the persecution of the Antichrist, followed by the General Judgment of all souls that will ever have lived, and so of all peoples.

Kyrie eleison.

BILLOT – II

No. CCCXXXVII (337)

December 28, 2013

Cardinal Billot points out how the fifth Letter to the Churches of Asia (Apoc. II and III) is remarkably well suited to our own times.

It is not only by the names of the seven Churches of Asia (cf. “Comments”#) but also by the contents of the seven Letters addressed to them (Apoc. II and III) that Cardinal Billot establishes the connection between the Letters and seven main periods of Church history. Especially interesting in this respect is the Letter to the church of Sardis (Apoc. III, 1–6) which would correspond to our own Age, the fifth, the Age of Apostasy. After evoking the wealth, luxury and material prosperity associated with Croesus, famous ruler of Sardis, Billot writes:—

“As one might expect, this church seems to be in a state of spiritual decline. Apostasy and falling away are on all sides, but while the majority of souls abandon religion, there are a few who remain faithful to Christ. The angel says, ‘Thou hast a few names in Sardis which have not defiled their garments.’ But: ‘Thou hast the name of being alive: and thou art dead!’ The name (but not the reality) of life, knowledge, freedom, civilization, progress; and thou art dead, sitting in darkness and the shadow of death, because the light of life, which is Our Lord Jesus Christ, has been rejected. Hence the bishop of Sardis is told, ‘Be watchful and strengthen the things that remain, which are ready to die.’ And he is above all recommended to cleave unfailingly to all the traditions of the holy Apostles, without in the least way departing from the meaning they held for the Church Fathers, with the excuse or under the appearance of a deeper understanding: ‘Have in mind therefore what thou hast received and heard: and observe, and do penance.’ So much for the Fifth Age. But what follows is a little more rejoicing.” And the Cardinal goes on to the Sixth and Seventh Ages.

Readers who have never read the first six verses of Apocalypse III in connection with our own times should be interested to do so. The connection is remarkable, and not co-incidental.

It is remarkable because “Strengthen the things that remain, which are ready to die” corresponds exactly to the Counter-reformation saving Catholicism from

Protestantism, to the anti-liberal Popes saving what remained of the Church from the French Revolution, to Archbishop Lefebvre (and others) rescuing Tradition from Vatican II, and now to a Resistance battling to save what can be saved from his Society collapsing into liberalism. Surely Catholics may take heart from this perspective, that their long and seemingly hopeless rearguard action comes from a distant past and does fit into an ultimately triumphant future. That is why we were given the book of the Apocalypse.

Nor is the connection co-incidental. Our Lord promised his Apostles (Jn. XVI, 12–14) that his Spirit, the Holy Ghost, would be with them and with their successors down the ages to reveal to them what they would only then need to know. It was only when the Thirty Years War (1618–1648) was ravaging Germany that the Venerable Holzhauser was given his understanding of the Seven Ages hidden within the Letters to the seven churches of Asia. Similarly it was only when the Russian Revolution was just about to break out that we needed Our Lady to assure us at Fatima that in the end her Immaculate Heart would triumph. True, the Church is right now being eclipsed (see on the Internet the film-clips of the public Mass celebrated recently in Brazil by the churchman in white), but there is still no need or justification for us to become liberals.

Kyrie eleison.